

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1875.

I.—THE LORD'S-SUPPER.

WE wish, in this paper, to set forth the Scripture idea of the Lord's-supper in a plain, practical way, in order to correct certain erroneous views of it held by many, and to lead all to a higher appreciation of its value. There is need of this on several accounts. On the one hand, Rationalism is trying to undermine all faith in the Church and its ordinances; and, on the other hand, Ritualism seeks a return to Romanism, with its superstitious notions of the efficacy of the sacraments. Skepticism and Sacerdotalism, though coming from opposite poles, are strangely akin, and are united in the one great purpose of destroying the Gospel of God; for just as either prevails in any land, the religion of Christ declines. An empty and deceitful philosophy, with its pride and self-sufficiency, darkens the understanding and corrupts the heart; while a superstitious reverence for and trust in, ordinances allures men from the simplicity of Christ. In the next place, even among those regarded as evangelical, there are grave misconceptions of this institution; and hence the discussions, daily growing in number and interest, upon open and close communion, its true relation to baptism, and the frequency of its observance. Among Disciples there is not entire agreement as to how they should treat the unimmersed when the Lord's-table is spread; and, more than all, they are far from a just estimate of its importance, and

VOL. VI.—I

a proper attendance upon it. They, hence, do not derive from it in their assemblies the benefit it was intended to impart to believers.

We have, in the foregoing observations, hinted at the course to be pursued in the present discussion, and the practical object we have in view. We shall allow ourselves considerable latitude; but if we reach our destination in safety, we shall feel amply rewarded for the toils and dangers of the voyage. To give some order and logical coherence to what we have to say, and to serve as guiding stars on the way, we shall pursue the route marked out in the following division:

I. The Nature of Sacraments, specially the Eucharist.

II. The Romish View.

III. The Lutheran View.

IV. The Scripture View.

V. Communion as practiced by (1.) The Pedobaptists; (2.) The Baptists; (3.) The Disciples.

I. OF THE NATURE OF SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL, AND OF THE LORD'S-SUPPER IN PARTICULAR.

In entering upon any discussion, we should keep constantly in view the difference between the thing and the idea, and between both these and the word which represents them. There is, first, the thing as it exists in nature; second, the idea in the mind; and, third, the word upon the tongue. The idea is a mental image of the thing; the word is a sign of the idea. The thing is objective, the idea is subjective, the word is both. The correspondence of the thing and the idea is natural, and forms actual truth; the agreement of the idea and the word is arbitrary, and constitutes veracity. The special object in view, or mere convenience, will often determine the order we should follow in treating a subject. We may choose the order of development, and explain the nature of the thing; then the correct or erroneous ideas of it in other minds; and, thirdly, the propriety of the words used to represent it. Or we may speak, first, of its symbols; then men's conceptions of it; and, lastly, the essential nature of the thing itself. We shall begin with the words used to designate what are called sacraments.

The history of this word *sacrament* is interesting, extending, as it does, away back into the forms of Roman law, where it first meant the deposit made by both parties to a suit, and which the loser for-

feited to religious uses. This deposit, or pledge, being thus devoted, became sacred, and was hence called "*sacramentum*." From the legal it soon passed over to the military affairs of the Romans. In its military sense it came to signify the oath which every soldier had to take never to desert his standard, nor turn his back to the foe, nor abandon his commander. It, thirdly, came to mean any oath whatsoever. This is its antechristian use; and as it was a common word when the Church began to conquer the Roman Empire, it was natural enough it should be assumed to designate the solemn obligations under which men came to Christ as their great commander. At first it was applied to any sacred transaction whatever, of special solemnity; and in that use there were many sacraments in the Old as well as the New Testament dispensation. Were this simple fact borne in mind, we should have little dispute with Romanists about the number of the sacraments. They might as well claim fourteen or twenty-one, or any number, as the definite seven for which they contend. At last the word came to be applied to baptism and the Supper, owing to the peculiarly sacred character of these ordinances; and they are the only sacraments which Protestants allow, in opposition to the Romanists, who, with no show of reason, maintain that Baptism, the Lord's-supper, Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Ordination, and Marriage, are all sacraments. At present, the word, when used without any qualification, designates the Lord's-supper; but it is as equally applicable to baptism.

There are many other names given to this sacred feast which need only be mentioned here; such as the Eucharist, from the Greek word *Εὐχαριστία*, meaning a giving of thanks; *Εὐλογία*, a blessing; *Προσφορά*, offering; *Θυσία*, sacrifice; *Μυστήριον*, mystery; *Εὐναξίς*, the assembly. These Greek names all denote some conception of this sacred institution held by the ancient Church, which will be perceived on a moment's reflection. By Roman Catholics it is mostly called the mass or missa, no doubt because the words used in dismissing the assembly of the faithful in early times were, "*Ite, missa est*"—"Go, the congregation is dismissed."

In the Scriptures we find it called the Lord's-supper, the Lord's-table, the Breaking of Bread, the Communion; each of which points out some peculiarity of the ordinance. It is not strictly a "supper;" for the word rendered *supper* means any meal, and answers to our

generic word *feast*. Besides it supplies the place of no meal, and may properly enough be eaten at any hour of the day or night. Paul contrasts the "Lord's-table" with the table of devils or demons, alluding to the tables spread in heathen temples, and at which the worshipers feasted upon the victims offered in sacrifice. He says, furthermore, that the loaf and cup are the communion of the body and blood of Christ. Luke very properly calls this institution, "The breaking of bread;" more correctly, the breaking of the loaf. Thus it is known in the Acts of the Apostles, thirty years after its institution; for says he, "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of the loaf, and in prayers;" again, "They assembled for the breaking of the loaf."

We come now to consider the nature of a sacrament, the thing itself,—not its name merely. According to Augustine, there must be the union of the Word of God with an element before there can be a sacrament. This means that there must be used in a sacrament some material element, by the appointment of God, and for a special purpose. To the same effect is what other ancient theologians have said, that there must be an outward sign and an inward grace. The Westminster Confession defines sacraments thus:

"Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits, and to confirm our interest in him; as, also, to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the Church and the rest of the world: and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ, according to his word.

"There is, in every sacrament, a spiritual relation or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass, that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other.

"The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution; which contains, together with a precept, authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers."

The Church of England defines a sacrament to be "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

According to these definitions, baptism and the Lord's-supper are certainly sacraments; and it is just as certain that the five additional ones claimed by the Roman Catholics are not. A sacrament

must *signify* something, *convey* something, and *confirm* something. As it accomplishes the first, it is a sign outward and visible; as it conveys grace, it is a means thereof definite and specific; and as it confirms to us the faithfulness of God, it is a seal having his own image and superscription. If, now, we examine the two great institutions of Christ, and what the apostles say of them, we shall find they do all this by his own appointment, that there is a specific grace conveyed to us through each, and that there can be no compensation for their neglect. They both have respect to Christ, but to him in two very different relations to us. By baptism we are buried with Christ, and rise with him to walk in a new life. Christ is thus held up to us as the author of our new life; and baptism is a sign of our passing out of the world, the kingdom of darkness, a state of alienation from God, into the church, the kingdom of God's dear Son, a state of entire reconciliation. All this we profess in our baptism; and we can not conceive a more significant sign of it than the immersion which the Lord Jesus Christ appointed. It is also the means ordained by the Savior through which we are saved from our sins, and become partakers of the Holy Spirit; for thus spake Peter on Pentecost: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This beautiful sacrament is also a seal of our discipleship. Upon it are inscribed the names of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and all the ineffable attributes of the Godhead are pledged to bestow on the believing penitent, through his submission to their authority in this sacrament, all that the Savior promised. It was hence regarded in the first ages as the sacrament of regeneration, or the new life.

In like manner, the Supper was appointed by Christ to set forth continually his sacrificial death, his body broken, and his blood shed for us; and by partaking of these emblems we partake of him, by faith we commune with, and feed upon, him. His blood, symbolized in the cup, seals to us the everlasting covenant, and gives us confidence that he will ultimately bring us into the land of rest which he has gone to prepare for his people. As a sign, it is commemorative; as a means, it conveys spiritual nourishment; and, as a seal, it ratifies to us eternal redemption at his second coming. It is, therefore, the sacrament of continued life in Christ. By being once

baptized, we put on Christ; and by constantly communing, we are kept alive and sustained in him. They are both divine in origin, and of perpetual obligation; the one the sign and seal of our engrafting into Christ, the other of our life and support from him.

II. Having stated the nature of sacraments in general, and illustrated our views by reference to baptism and the Lord's-supper, which are universally accounted to be such, we come, in the second place, to consider the various erroneous views held of the latter in both ancient and modern times. The first that claims our attention, as well on account of its antiquity as the number and ability of the theologians who have maintained it, is the one held by the Roman Catholic Church. Its standards declare the Eucharist to be both a sacrament and a *sacrifice*. The first it is, according to our definition; the second it can not be, in the light of Holy Scripture: and this we now proceed to prove.

Romanists contend that it is the actual change of the elements into the body and blood of Christ that gives to the Supper its efficacy, both as a sacrament and a sacrifice. With them, therefore, transubstantiation is a fundamental article of belief. The Council of Trent decreed that, "*Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimæ eucharistiæ sacramento contineri vere, realiter, et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem una cum anima, et Divinitate Domini nostri, Jesu Christi: ac proinde totum Christum, sed dixerit tantummodo esse in eo, ut in signo, vel figura aut virtute: anathema sit.*" This canon may be rendered thus: "If any one shall deny that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist there are contained, truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, along with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and accordingly the entire Christ, but shall say he is in it only as in a sign or figure, or by his power: let him be accursed." We could multiply quotations *ad infinitum*; but it would be superfluous, seeing it is not denied that the doctrine of transubstantiation, or the actual change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in the mass, is held by all Catholics, and that in it are offered up, *in sacrifice*, the real body, soul, and divinity of our Lord. This it is that, in their estimation, gives the Eucharist its efficacy: it is with them a real sacrifice. In opposition to this we maintain that the breaking of bread is a sacrament in which, by sen-

sible signs, is signified the feasting of the soul upon the Lord Jesus, the sacrifice made once for all. There is but one sacrifice in Christianity, and that being perfect was made but once. This constitutes its superiority over the sacrifices under the law which, being imperfect, had to be repeated, because they could not make him who did the service perfect as to the conscience.

Like most great errors in theology, this one is intermingled with some truth. In all the sacrifices, except one, among both the Jews and the heathen nations of antiquity, there was a feast made upon the victims offered upon the altar. They first slew the animal, gave a part to God, a part to the priest, and then feasted upon the rest, thus signifying that God, the priests, and the people could eat in amity at the same table; that peace was made by the sacrifice of the victim's life and the offering of its blood, and now all could dwell together in holy and blessed fellowship. The sacrifice was one thing, the feast upon the sacrifice another, yet most closely connected. So in the Supper we offer no sacrifice: Jesus did that when he went into heaven. But he consecrated bread and wine to be forever in his Church the memorials of his body and blood; and upon these memorials we feast as in the Jewish and patriarchal age the worshipers feasted on the sacrifice. They literally ate the victim; we eat by faith. "The flesh profiteth nothing. It is the Spirit that quickeneth: the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life."

As this is a point of great importance, we shall be at some pains to develop it. The learned Cudworth, over two hundred and fifty years ago, gave to the world a lucid and Scriptural division of sacrifices, which will greatly aid us to clear conceptions upon the whole subject: He divides them into,—

"First. Such as were wholly offered up to God, and burned upon the altar, which were the holocausts, or burnt-offerings.

"Secondly. Such, wherein besides something offered unto God upon the altar, the priests had also a part to eat of. And these are also subdivided into the sin-offerings and the trespass-offerings.

"Thirdly. Such as in which, besides something offered up to God, and a portion bestowed on the priests, the owners themselves had a share likewise. And these were called peace-offerings, which contained in them as the Jewish doctors speak, a portion for God, for the priests, and for the owners also."

From this, and much more that might be said to the same purpose, it is evident that the eating of the sacrifices followed the offering

up of the victim's blood, and was a proper concomitant of it. A few out of many allusions to this custom may be given, to set the matter forever at rest. In Exodus xxxix, 15, God cautions the Jews against making a covenant with the people of Canaan, worshiping their gods and *eating* their sacrifices. This actually came to pass afterward, as is recorded in Numbers xxv, 2. David, in Psalm cvi, 28, says, "They joined themselves unto Baal-peor, and *ate* the sacrifice of the dead." In 1 Samuel xvi, it is recorded that Samuel went to Bethlehem to anoint David. "I am come," saith he, "to sacrifice to the Lord; sanctify yourselves, and come with me to the sacrifice." But David was absent, and hence Samuel says, "Send and fetch him, for we will not *sit down* until he come." Compare what Paul says in 1 Corinthians x, "The people *sat down to eat and drink*," with Exodus xxxii, "And they rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt-offerings, and brought peace-offerings, and the people *sat down to eat and drink*;" and it will appear that they ate and drank what had been offered to the golden calf. By that example, the apostle would dissuade the Corinthians from eating things offered unto idols. To eat upon the mountains is put, in Ezekiel xviii, for sacrificing upon the mountains, because the one was always found joined to the other.

It is hardly necessary to remind the classical scholar that, all through the writings of antiquity, there are allusions to this common and wide-spread custom of feasting upon sacrifice. In the "Iliad," Homer describes many sacrifices made by his heroes to the gods, and the magnificent feasts that followed. The same is true of Virgil. Besides these, Plato, Plutarch, Strabo, and many others, allude to the same custom.

To one who looks deeply into the philosophy of history, there are few facts more mysterious than the prevalence, throughout the Old World, of sacrifice, and this equally prevalent custom of feasting on the carcass of the victim. The most cultivated as well as the most rude nations have observed it. The idea came, as the Bible represents, from God, and by tradition it has passed in some form or other to the whole race. Sacrifice can be understood only as it is referred to Christ on the cross, the one perfect and finished sacrifice in the end of the ages for the sins of the whole world. As men fell away from the Scripture idea of Christ's one perfect sacrifice, and yet felt the deep need of a propitiation for sin, they devised the doctrine

of the mass. The Holy Supper, that Jesus in sorrow instituted to remind his followers till his return of a sacrifice once completed on Calvary, and ever offered in heaven, was changed into the sacrifice itself, and an ignorant people were taught by avaricious priests to believe in the efficacy of the mass to propitiate God and relieve souls from purgatory. This monstrous doctrine of the mass has acted in two ways,—it has degraded the Cross, and exaggerated the work of the priest. How poor and mean these repetitions in comparison with the one offering of the body of Christ! How impotent the human priest compared with the High-priest of our profession, Jesus Christ!

The Supper, then, is no sacrifice, but a *feast upon sacrifice*, and answers to those feasts among Jews and Gentiles made upon the bodies of the slain victims. Those sacrifices were innumerable, and continued for four thousand years; but Christ, by the one sacrifice of himself, put an end to them all; and, since the hour Jesus expired on the cross, there has been no sacrifice made by Divine sanction on the earth. In anticipation of this, and that his disciples to the end of time might be reminded of his expiatory death for the sin of the world, he instituted the Christian feast, in which his people hold communion by bread and wine with him and with one another. The sacrifices and the feasts following them under the law were only types; this in the Gospel is the reality. The Supper is not the sacrifice that was made *once* on the cross, and is being offered in heaven continually, while we feast here on earth by faith in it, through the emblems of his broken body and shed blood.

In the light of what has just been said, the argument against idolatry, in the tenth chapter of First Corinthians, is easily understood; and it confirms the idea we are here urging, that the Supper is no sacrifice, but a feast upon sacrifice. The argument, briefly put, is: We Christians regard our joint partaking of the loaf and cup in the Supper as symbolically partaking the benefits of Christ's death; and as there is one loaf, so we, the many, are one mystical body of Christ. Now, those who eat the sacrifices offered in Jewish and heathen temples are partakers of the altars upon which they have been offered; that is, they worship the divinity who presides over the temple and its altar, and partake of the benefits of that worship. But who are those worshiped in heathen temples? They are demons. Is, then,

the worship of the one living and true God compatible with the worship of demons? Can one be a partaker in the principles and practices of Christianity, and at the same time of heathenism? It is impossible. You ought not, therefore, to eat in heathen temples. "Ye can not drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye can not be partakers of the Lord's *table*, and of the table of devils."

This last remark leads us to another cogent argument against the Romish doctrine of the mass. It must be stated very briefly. Paul does not say we are partakers of the Lord's *altar*, but the Lord's *table*. The argument is the more forcible because it is undesigned. There is no literal altar in the Church of Christ, neither is there a literal priest. Christ is altar, victim, and priest in himself.

He is called our altar in Hebrews xiii, 10. Whenever the writers of the New Testament speak of literal altars and priests, it is those of Judaism or heathenism they refer to; never do they speak of an altar or a priest in the Church of Christ. These are wholly unknown there. But the mass is a sacrifice, true and real, of the whole Christ. Hence, there are altars and sacrificing priests in the Roman Church. The elevation of the host by the priest is held to be a true and proper sacrifice; and this is of the very essence of Romanism. Take away this, with what depends upon it, and the whole fabric crumbles into ruins. Put these, or either of them, into the Church of Christ, and you subvert it at once. We, hence, conclude that the Church of Rome is not the Church of Christ, the mass is not the Supper, the loaf is not the flesh of Jesus.

But the doctrine of Rome as to the Eucharist is as repugnant to reason as it is contradictory of Scripture. That Church teaches that the elements are changed by the act of consecration into the body and blood of our Lord, as really and truly as he changed the water into wine at the marriage festival in Cana of Galilee. A proposition so extraordinary should be supported by evidence of the most unequivocal and satisfactory character. Is that submitted by Romanists of this kind? Just the reverse. We freely concede that the language of Scripture must be understood in its literal sense, unless the nature of the subject or the context forbids it, or the literal meaning involves some palpable contradiction or absurdity. We admit freely that Jesus said, "This is my body." So he said, "I am the vine;" "I am the door;" "I am the bread;" and much more in the same

style. It is just as reasonable to affirm that while Jesus was living he was literal bread, as to say that after his death the memorial bread is his flesh. Christ could change bread into flesh as easily as he changed water into wine; but he could change neither into himself, for this involves an absurdity.

To accept the doctrine of Rome we must ignore the testimony of our senses. They attest, as clearly as any thing can be attested, that after consecration the elements are still bread and wine. It is no answer to call it a miracle or a mystery. God never requires us to believe any thing contrary to the testimony of our senses. There are in Christianity both miracles and mysteries, but there are neither contradictions nor absurdities.

Furthermore, the whole doctrine of transubstantiation rests upon a false interpretation of Scripture. When a stranger, coming into my parlor and being struck with a fine portrait upon the wall, asks, "Who is that?" and I reply, "That is my father," I speak truly, but figuratively; just as Joseph did when he said, "The seven good kine *are* seven years;" or Daniel, when he said, "Thou art that head of gold;" or John, when he said, "The seven stars are the angels of the seven Churches;" or Jesus, when he said, "This is my body." It is worthy of remark that while Romanists contend for a literal interpretation of one part of the words of institution, they are just as earnest in denying it to another. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Is the cup a testament literally? Yet Christ says it is, just as plainly as he says the loaf is his body. The emblematic loaf and cup are by Paul called the communion of Christ's body and blood. Are they literally a communion? Certainly not. When to all this we add that the bread and wine are called such after consecration as much as before, there remains but one conclusion, and that is, that the doctrine of transubstantiation is as much opposed to Scripture as it is repugnant to reason. It is hence false.

The sixth chapter of John is the final appeal with Romanists when all else fails them; and much reliance is placed on such language as, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you;" "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;" "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him." These, and other expressions of like import, they insist are literal, and refer to the Lord's-supper.

Both of these assumptions are erroneous, as must appear from the general and special scope of the passage itself, and from parallel texts. If the language is to be taken literally, then if it refer to the eating of the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist, it follows that whoever has *once* eaten it shall live forever, he shall never die. But this, Romanists do not believe; they are hence inconsistent. The occasion of delivering this discourse proves beyond all question that our Lord had no allusion whatever to the Eucharist. It was spoken to unbelieving Jews before the Eucharist was appointed, and to rebuke them for following him simply because they had eaten of the loaves and fishes he had distributed to them the day before. To receive the Lord Jesus by faith, is to eat his flesh and drink his blood; and this the chapter obviously teaches to those not blinded by a false theory.

Christ is the food and drink of our spirits: this is the lesson taught here. The same is taught by the Supper. They both relate to a deep spiritual truth, that just as, by eating, digesting, and assimilating bread, the body is renewed day by day, and thus its vital powers sustained, so Christ is the bread of our souls, and he becomes the source of life to every Christian. "The outward man perishes, but the inward man is renewed day by day." The fifteenth chapter of John, in which Christ is called the true vine, teaches the same blessed truth, only in another figure. He is "the true vine," and he is "the true bread." Yes: both figuratively, but neither literally.

When driven from Scripture, the Romanist has recourse to tradition to sustain his views of the Lord's-supper; but this will not avail, for the rise and gradual development of transubstantiation can be traced historically. It had to fight its way to recognition along with infant baptism, purgatory, and extreme unction. These, and kindred corruptions of the doctrine of Christ, gave rise to dissensions and conflicts innumerable, which are matters of record. The history of this corrupt and corrupting doctrine contains a solemn warning. Ever since its introduction it has led to the most degrading superstition and idolatrous worship. The adoration of the host is a well-known example. It has turned a simple and beautiful ordinance of Christ into a source of money-getting for a corrupt clergy; it was the means of transferring most of the land and wealth of Europe into the coffers of the Church, and thus gave it almost unlimited power over kings and people; and, finally, it has corrupted the whole doc-

trine of Christ by introducing into it a sacrifice and a sacrificing priesthood of which the Gospel knows absolutely nothing.

III. THE LUTHERAN VIEW. Having dwelt at such length upon the Romish doctrine, we need not delay upon the Lutheran idea of the Eucharist. If there be one point in which, more than another, the great Reformer failed, it was in his conception of this institution; and this caused great dissension and division among his followers. It led ultimately to a formal separation between them and those who followed the lead of Zwingli and Calvin. While Luther lagged behind befogged in the mists of Babylon as far as the doctrine of the Lord's-supper is concerned, the Swiss reformer emerged into the clear light of Divine truth, freed from the traditions and corruptions of men. There never would have been a formal division between the German and Swiss—the Lutherans and Reformed—had it not been for the dogmatism of Luther upon this subject. D'Aubigné has given a graphic description of the meeting of the two parties at Marburg, under the protection of Philip of Hesse, in order to come to some agreement upon the matters that divided them. On the 2d of October, 1529, the Conference met; and, as soon as it was opened, Luther, taking a piece of chalk, wrote in large letters, "*HOC EST CORPUS MEUM.*" This was the key-note of the controversy, as far as the great Saxon was concerned. In his discussion with Zwingli, Luther rejects the transubstantiation of the Romish Church, and, instead, proposes consubstantiation. This difference is simply this: the former is the doctrine that the bread and wine are changed into the real body and blood of Christ; the latter, that Christ is really received in, with, and under them. According to the Lutherans, the two substances, the earthly and the heavenly, coexist, but are not changed the one into the other; neither do they commingle. They take their stand upon the words of institution, "This is my body," and accept these literally; they admit no figure of speech of any kind in any part of this proposition. Their symbols affirm the true and substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the sacrament; that the emblems do not signify an absent Christ, but in sacramental union with them; and that this union is effected, not by the consecration of men, but by the omnipotent power of Jesus Christ.

It will readily be perceived that this view of the Eucharist differs not, materially or essentially, from that of the Catholic Church; it is questionable whether it be a whit nearer the truth. The words of institution are either literal or figurative. If the former, we may as well accept the Catholic doctrine; if the latter, neither it nor Luther's view can stand. We have shown they are figurative, and hence have disposed of consubstantiation; a word, by the way, which Lutherans reject. "I believe," said Luther, "that Christ's body is in heaven; but I also believe that it is in the sacrament. It concerns me little whether it be against nature, provided it be not against faith. Christ is substantially in the sacrament, as he was born of the Virgin." D'Aubigné sums up the controversy as follows:

"Thus the Reformation had made a sensible step at Marburg. The opinion of Zwingli on the spiritual presence, and of Luther on the bodily presence, are both found in Christian antiquity. But both the extreme doctrines have always been rejected: that of the Rationalists, on the one hand, who behold in the Eucharist nothing but a simple commemoration; and of the Papists, on the other, who adore in it a transubstantiation. These are both errors; while the doctrines of Luther and Zwingli, and the medium taken by Calvin, already maintained by some of the Fathers, were considered in ancient times as different views of the same truth. If Luther had yielded, it might have been feared that the Church would fall into the extreme of rationalism; if Zwingli, that it would rush into the extreme of Popery. It is a salutary thing for the Church that these different views should be entertained; but it is a pernicious thing for individuals to attach themselves to one of them in such a manner as to anathematize the other. 'There is only this little stumbling-block,' wrote Melancthon, 'that embarrasses the Church of our Lord.'

"All—Romanists and Evangelicals. Saxons and Swiss—admitted the presence, and even the real presence, of Christ; but here was the essential point of separation: Is this presence effected by the faith of the communicant, or by the *opus operatum* of the priest? The germs of Popery, Sacerdotalism, Puseyism, are inevitably contained in this latter thesis. If it is maintained that a wicked priest (as has been said) operates this real presence of Christ by three words, we enter the Church of the Pope. Luther appeared sometimes to admit this doctrine; but he has often spoken in a more spiritual manner; and, taking this great man in his best moments, we behold merely an essential unity and a secondary diversity in the two parties of the Reformation. Undoubtedly, the Lord has left to his Church outward ordinances; but he has not attached salvation to them. The essential point is the connection of the faithful with the Word, with the Holy Ghost, with the Head of the Church. This is the great truth which the Swiss Reform proclaims, and which Lutheranism itself recognizes. After the Marburg Conference, the controversy became more moderate."

IV. THE SCRIPTURE VIEW. Those who, in the sixteenth century, broke away from the communion of Rome, are designated as

Protestants. These embrace those known as Lutherans, following closely the lead and teachings of the great Saxon; and, secondly, the Reformers, who departed still more than their brethren from the tenets and practices of the Mother Church. Among the Reformers, again, there were early found three divisions,—those who adhered to Zwingli, those who followed Calvin, and an intermediate class, whose views ultimately prevailed.

To no one more than to Zwingli are we indebted for the shape given to the doctrine of the sacraments in the infancy of the Reformation. Luther himself sinks in our estimation when he grapples with the pastor of Zurich upon the doctrine of the Real Presence. They were nearly of the same age, Zwingli being only a few weeks the younger. They were both men of extraordinary ability and great learning, but of very different temperaments. Luther was constitutionally superstitious, Zwingli the reverse. Both were men of fearless heart and unswerving integrity; but the Swiss surpassed the German in the power of laying aside preconceptions and prejudices. The consequence was, that he made far less of the supernatural element in the sacraments than did Luther; and when to his clear view of the nature of the Eucharist there were added the unanswerable logic and Scripture knowledge of Calvin, a greater theologian than either, the controversy among the recusants from Rome was virtually ended. Nearly the whole Protestant family to-day hold the doctrine of Zwingli on this subject, and that is essentially the teaching of the Scriptures.

The Zwinglian statements are clearly given by Dr. Hodge, in his "Systematic Theology," Vol. III, page 626. He says that Zwingli taught that "the Lord's-supper is nothing else than the food of the soul, and Christ instituted the ordinance as a memorial of himself. When a man commits himself to the sufferings and redemption of Christ, he is saved. Of this he has left us a certain visible sign of his flesh and blood, both of which he has commanded us to eat and drink in remembrance of him." This is said in a document presented to the Council of Zurich in 1523.

In his "*Expositio Christianæ Fidei*," written just before his death, and published by Bullinger, in 1536, he says:

"The natural, substantial body of Christ, in which he suffered, and in which he is now seated in heaven at the right-hand of God, is not, in the Lord's-supper,

eaten corporeally, or as to its essence, but spiritually only. . . . Spiritually to eat Christ's body is nothing else than with the spirit and mind to rely on the goodness and mercy of God through Christ. . . . Sacramentally to eat his body, is the sacrament being added, with the mind and spirit to feed upon him."

There is nothing in these statements that we do not accept, since they accord with Scripture, as far as they go, and are the received doctrine of most Protestants. Whatever difference now exists among the various sects of the great Protestant family is more about the accidents than the essence of the ordinances. They severally have their own way of stating their faith; but when their creeds are closely examined they are found to substantially agree; more nearly so, perhaps, than on any other item of the Christian faith. Their differences are not as to the nature and design of the Lord's-supper, but in their explanations of it.

Turning to the Scriptures themselves, to ascertain what they teach concerning this ordinance, we find that Matthew, Mark, and Luke, each gives an account of its institution. They agree in almost every particular; and when to these we add what Paul says of it in the tenth and eleventh chapters of First Corinthians, we have all that is essential. From these testimonies we find that, on the night on which he was betrayed, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, "Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you;" that, in like manner, also he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." The apostle Paul adds to this: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." Such is the beautiful and simple narration of the institution of the Supper, and from it we gather the following particulars: It was appointed by Christ, and intended to be observed till he comes again; that the elements to be used are bread and wine; that blessing and thanksgiving are to be employed for the loaf and cup; that then they are to be distributed to the disciples, and by them received in commemoration of the Savior's death. Finally, that by eating and drinking these elements we discern the Lord's body, seal our acceptance of the new covenant, and declare our union with all the followers of Christ. These items can be easily made out; but they are so obvious that to delay upon them is unnecessary,

Taken in connection with what we have said at the outset on the nature of sacraments in general, and of the Lord's-supper in particular, we think any one of ordinary ability can understand, as far as our Lord intended us to understand, the nature, design, and benefits of this federal and symbolic rite. Like its companion ordinance, it has been greatly corrupted by the traditions, commandments, and doctrines of men. When baptism and the Supper shall have been reinstated in the positions appointed them by Christ, we may look for a restoration of primitive and apostolic Christianity, and not before. To recover these expressive ordinances from the corruptions of a dark and superstitious age, and place them in the house of God, where Jesus left them, must form a chief object of every effort to give a pure Gospel to the world. Rationalism would destroy them, Ritualism corrupt them; our own Reformation, instinct with the Spirit of life from God, should lift these witnesses for him out of the dust, and place them upon their feet once more, that they may testify till he come again.

V. COMMUNION AS PRACTICED BY PEDOBAPTISTS, BAPTISTS, AND THE DISCIPLES. It remains that we notice the divergence of views and practice in the modern Church upon the question of communion. The length of this article demands brevity of statement in what remains. There are but three important points of difference among the classes named above; and these have reference to the administrator, the recipient, and the frequency of its observance. We shall treat these interesting though somewhat difficult questions summarily.

First. There is nothing said in the New Testament as to the person whose prerogative it is to be the celebrant. At the time of its institution, Christ himself administered it; and in the allusions made to it in the Acts of the Apostles, it may be gathered that the apostles presided at its observance when they were present. Of course, Ritualists would have priests alone to administer the sacraments; but as there are no priests in Christianity, and as there is no restriction placed on believers as to preaching the Word and attending to any act of worship, we must, with the Bible as our guide, maintain that any Christian is authorized of God to do this, provided he have the ability. Sacerdotalism can have place only in

an apostolic Church. Nevertheless, good order and the reason of things suggest that those who give themselves to the public ministry should conduct this as well as any other service in the house of God. It was a general rule in the primitive Church that the elders, or bishops, presided at the Lord's-table. This is the custom among the Disciples of the present day; and where men of proper gifts are called to this office, and conduct the service as directed in the Scriptures, there is no part of our worship that impresses the beholder with greater reverence. It would excite criticism, if among us a congregation, having met for worship on the Lord's-day, should adjourn without breaking the loaf, merely because there was no preacher at hand. In this respect the Disciples differ from most Churches of the present day.

In regard to what is called open and close communion the position of the Disciples is somewhat peculiar. Pedobaptist Churches are generally open, or free, communionists. This they can be in harmony with their principles. All Churches agree that baptism is a prerequisite for acceptable communion at the Lord's-table; and as Pedobaptists accept sprinkling, pouring, and immersion as valid forms of baptism, they can consistently receive at the table of the Lord any one who has been baptized and is living a godly life. Baptists, however, do not allow any thing to be baptism but the immersion of a believer; and in this the Disciples are in perfect agreement with them; hence, neither of these Churches can consistently advocate open communion. There are, however, many Baptists who believe in and practice open communion, and with the Disciples it is in effect almost universal. The refusal of the Baptists to commune with the unimmersed, and yet accept them as Christians in every other act of worship, is palpably inconsistent, and is surpassed only by their refusal to commune with the Disciples who, as well as themselves, practice only believers' immersion. The fact is, the position of the Pedobaptists, with their views of baptism, is consistent. The error with them is not in regard to communion, but in regard to baptism. Here is where the whole difficulty lies with the modern Church. Restore the Lord's baptism, and the way is open for a restoration of the Lord's-supper; they must go together. It is now of vastly more importance to have evangelical alliances to consider the propriety of restoring the original immersion to the Church than to

waste time in abortive attempts to bring the Church to the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace, while the very ordinance by which we enter the one body is neglected. There can not, in the nature of the case, be one communion unless we have one immersion. "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, and *one immersion*, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." In these seven blessed units is to be found the union for which good men are working and praying. On the other hand, Baptists must re-adjust their practice to their theory on the communion question; for while they may, with some show of reason, refuse to commune with the unimmersed, they can not, on that ground, refuse to do so with the Disciples.

The view taken by the Disciples is, that the Supper is for the immersed alone; that Christ placed it in his Church or kingdom, and that only immersed believers are in that kingdom. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." They universally understand that to be born of water is to be immersed. This is the testimony they bear; and because duty to God requires them to do it firmly and unequivocally, many suppose they do it unkindly: but not so. There is less of bigotry in them as a body, as to their practice in the matter of communion, than in any other people; for they spread the table in their assemblies, and leave every one to judge for himself as to whether he will or will not partake. They presume not to judge. To his own Master each one stands or falls. So if one of their number should commune with others, he is never called to account. They allow in this matter perfect liberty. Having borne their testimony on the question of baptism, they feel they have done their duty; and in the matter of communion they leave every one free to follow his own convictions of duty. If he eats, they take no offense; neither if he do not eat. This, in the present anomalous condition of the Church, they consider the only safe ground. They are themselves but guests at the Lord's-table, and therefore do not assume the responsibility to either invite or forbid others. They know and teach that immersed believers commune; they leave all others to their own conscience and to God.

Those desiring to see the whole question discussed with ability and great clearness should consult *Lard's Quarterly* for 1863-64.

For the best defense of the Baptists in their practice of close communion, read Booth's "Vindication," and "Fuller" on "Communion." On the other side, the great and good Robert Hall has given the ablest argument for open communion that has ever appeared among them. See his works, Vol. III, Bohn's Edition, London, 1851.

There is no practice that distinguishes the Disciples from their co-religionists more than their *weekly* observance of the Lord's-supper. It is a capital item of their faith and practice; and it is probable that they have done more to call attention to the nature, design, and proper observance of this ordinance than all other people put together. Baptism and communion fill a large space in their writings, and their investigations into the history of these institutions have been pushed with great ability and industry. To restore these to the modern Church, as they were held and practiced by the apostles, they consider a great part of their mission as a people.

All their regularly established Churches break the loaf upon the first day of the week, whether there be an ordained minister present or not. They would omit any part of the service rather than this; for they hold it to be the chief object of their assembling on that day. There is a small congregation not ten miles from where we are writing this, that has not failed twice in nearly forty years to break the loaf on the first day of every week. This is not an exceptional case. Every-where the Disciples meet on the first day of the week to break bread.

Their reasons for this they collect from the Scriptures, and confirm them by the example of the early Church. It is freely conceded that there is no positive command to break the loaf on the first day of every week; but it is so fairly implied in the allusions to its observance in the New Testament, that it should have the force of a positive precept with those anxious to know the mind and will of God. In Acts xx, 7, it is recorded that "on the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break the loaf, Paul discoursed to them, about to depart on the next day." We are here told the day on which the Church was accustomed to meet, and the object for which it met, to break the loaf; and as there is neither precept nor example for doing it on any other day, we conclude that such was the practice of the first Christians; and their example is a sufficient warrant to us. As there is *no evidence at all* for monthly, quarterly,

or yearly communion, and all there is, is in favor of our practice, in the absence of any good reason against it, the question is virtually settled with all who wish to conform to apostolic precedent.

The Lord's-table is a part of the furniture in the Lord's house, as much as was the table of shew-bread in the tabernacle. On this was spread every Sabbath-day the loaves of God's presence; and they were eaten by his priests on the first day of every week, the day after the Sabbath; and, in the antitype, the analogy is complete, provided God's real priests follow the example set them by the apostles.

The simple record of the Church at Jerusalem in the second chapter of the Acts, and of the Church at Troas in the twentieth chapter, indicate that the Supper was an essential part of the service of the disciples in their regular and stated meetings. The Church of Corinth met on the first day of every week, to show forth the Lord's death, as recorded in Acts, eleventh chapter, and no reason can be given for their meeting on the Lord's-day at all that will not with equal force show that they met to break bread.

When to this, and more that could be said to the same purpose, we add the practice of the Church for a long time after the death of the apostles, and until this, with almost every other institution of Christ, was corrupted by an admixture of heathen rites and ceremonies, there can be no reasonable doubt as to the practice of the early Church. As a sample of the testimony that might be adduced, we give the following from Justin Martyr. He says:

"On Sunday, we all assemble in one place, both those who live in the city and they who dwell in the country, and the writings of apostles and prophets are read so long as the time permits. When the reader stops, the president of the assembly makes an address, in which he recapitulates the glorious things that have been read, and exhorts the people to follow them. Then we all stand up together and pray. After prayer, bread, wine, and water are brought in. The president of the meeting again prays according to his ability, and gives thanks, to which the people respond, Amen. After this, the bread, wine, and water are distributed to those present, and the deacons carry portions to such as are necessarily detained from the meeting. Those who are able and willing, contribute what they please in money, which is given to the president of the meeting, and is appropriated to the support of widows and orphans, the sick, the poor, and whomsoever is necessitous."

Coleman, in his "Christian Antiquities," comes to the following conclusion:

"Whatsoever theories may exist respecting the original institution of the Christian Sabbath, it is an established historical truth that it was observed very

early in the *second century*; and that *the sacrament was usually celebrated on that day*. This was doubtless the *status dies*—the fixed, appointed day of Pliny. It is distinctly mentioned in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, page 57. The genuineness of the passage has indeed been called in question, and the controversy is still unsettled. The observance of the day may be clearly shown from Tertullian. Justin Martyr says, "We all meet together on Sunday;" and the reason assigned is, that this is the first day of the week, when in the beginning light was created, and when also our Lord Jesus Christ arose from the dead. It was called also *dies panis* (*the day of bread*), with evident allusion to the celebration of the sacrament on that day. The weekly celebration of the sacrament was strongly recommended at the Reformation; but no positive enactment was made to that effect."

If we consult modern theologians, commentators, and critics, they all, without dissent, agree that it was the custom of the primitive Christians to break the loaf on the first day of every week. Brown, of Haddington; King, Archbishop of Dublin; Dr. Mason, of New York; Wesley, the founder of Methodism; the great Calvin, and a host of others, could be quoted in confirmation; but this would only increase the number, without adding any thing to the force of what has been said.

When the Disciples shall have restored to the Church the ordinances as delivered by the apostles in theory and in practice they will have accomplished their distinctive mission; for with these will come the union of all believers, according to the sacerdotal prayer of Christ, and with that the conversion of the world.

II.—THE TRUE RELATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT TO THE SINNER IN CONVERSION.

AUGUSTINE stands out in the fifth century as the originator of German Calvinism. In his earlier life he advocated an entirely different system. But his controversy with Pelagius seems to have revolutionized his theological and anthropological beliefs. So it appears that modern Calvinism, in its essential features, is an extreme reaction from the extremism of Pelagius. In admitting his change of views, Augustine virtually admits that they were not in accordance with the teaching of the fathers and the belief of the Church. Dr. Döllinger repudiates his teaching "on the necessity of Divine grace, as not in perfect conformity with the tradition of the Church." (Eccl. Hist., Vol. II, page 44, Cox's Transl.)

In justice to Augustine, it ought to be said that Calvin went beyond him in some important matters. Calvinism and Augustinism, although essentially alike, yet are, in some particulars, dissimilar.

Augustine, says an eminent authority, "undoubtedly taught the doctrines of election and reprobation revived by Calvin, though there was an important difference in their systems. But St. Augustine did *not* teach that God had predestined or decreed the fall of Adam, and the consequent corruption and ruin of his posterity by sin; and thus he escapes the charge of making God the author of sin. The foundation of his system, like that of Calvin, rests on a theory of original sin,—that all mankind became, on account of transgression, a mass of sin and perdition (*massa perditionis*); or, as he says, a condemned batch (*conspersio damnata*), and thus that all free will to good was extinct or annihilated. To this fallen mass, the posterity of Adam, the guilt and penalty of his transgression was conveyed by generation, and inseparably and inherently belonged; and from this hereditary bond of guilt and condemnation none could be delivered but by the grace of Christ, which grace was given by the new birth in holy baptism; all the baptized being, by the sacrament, regenerated, placed in a state of grace and salvation. . . . Thus, the especial difference between Augustinism and Calvinism was, that, according

to the former system, God was not in any degree chargeable with the sin of Adam and of his posterity. The important difference related to the grace of holy baptism, St. Augustine believing in the real bestowal of *sacramental* grace, or that all the baptized in and through baptism were regenerated. Calvin did not believe that grace, in any real sense, was bestowed on the non-elect." (*Vide* Blunt's Hist. of Doct. and Hist. Theol., Art. "Calvanism.")

HODGE ON REGENERATION.

Among the advocates of modern Calvinism, Dr. Hodge, of Princeton Theological Seminary, stands pre-eminent. In his "Systematic Theology" he has boldly espoused and defended the Augustinian doctrine of miraculous regeneration, as logically necessitated by Augustine's doctrine of a corrupted nature transmitted by natural generation. Thus: "First, it is mysterious and peculiar; second, distinct from common grace; third, distinct from moral suasion; fourth, acts immediately, and is, in a certain sense, physical; fifth, it is irresistible; sixth, the soul is passive; seventh, regeneration is instantaneous; eighth, it is an act of sovereign grace." With Dr. Hodge, the regeneration of the sinner is an act of God's almighty power, in the same category as the raising of Lazarus or Jesus from the dead. He says:

"Regeneration is not only an act of God, but also an act of his almighty power. . . . If an act of omnipotence, it is certainly efficacious; for nothing can resist almighty power. . . . The assertion that regeneration is an act of God's omnipotence, is, and is intended to be, a denial that it is an act of moral suasion. It is an affirmation that it is 'physical,' in the old sense of that word, as opposed to moral; and it is immediate, as opposed to mediate, or through or by the truth. When, either in Scripture or in theological writings, the word *regeneration* is taken in a wide sense, as including conversion or the voluntary turning of the soul to God, then, indeed, it is said to be the word. . . . Raising Lazarus from the dead was an act of omnipotence. Nothing intervened between the volition and the effect. The act of quickening was the act of God. In that matter Lazarus was passive. But in all the acts of restored vitality, he was active and free." (Sys. Theol., page 31.)

On page 32, the doctor proceeds to consider regeneration subjectively. "As an effect or change wrought in the soul, it is not an act; nor is it any conscious exercise of any kind. It is something which lies lower than consciousness." Yet, he tells us, it is not a change of the substance of the soul; but that it is such a determining change

OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

1875.]

True Relation of the Holy Spirit to the Sinner

25

of "the states, dispositions, principles, or habits of the soul, that when consciousness becomes active, all the tendencies are Godward." "This is what the Bible calls the heart, which has the same relation to all our acts that the nature of a tree, as good or bad, has to the character of its fruit." According to Dr. Hodge, such is the doctrine of the Westminster Confession.

In perfect accord with the foregoing views, Dr. N. L. Rice, in debate with A. Campbell, urged that the nature of a person before regeneration is as different from his nature afterward as the lion's nature is from the lamb's, or the nature of a peach-tree from that of the deadly upas. (*Vide* Campbell and Rice Debate, page 672.) "So," he further contends, "may an infant possess a holy nature (that is, by regeneration); so that when first it shall look upon God in heaven, it will love, adore, and worship him." Again, page 635, he holds thus: "As he [God] created man holy, so can he new-create him. As he created Adam in his own image without words, so can he renew the infant mind, and prepare it for heaven, though it can not receive the truth."

Dr. Rice makes the same distinction between regeneration and conversion as given already by Dr. Hodge; that is, regeneration is an act of God precedent to conversion; that conversion is a subsequent voluntary act of the sinner, made possible by regeneration. Hence, one may be regenerate without being converted, and, as in the case of all infants dying in infancy, may enter heaven unconverted. Such unscriptural assumptions are the results of a theory which originally consigned all infants, dying unbaptized, to eternal damnation. And it is further plain that this nice distinction between regeneration and conversion was invented to escape the objection raised against the theory of miraculous regeneration; namely, that it renders useless the Word of God, preaching, etc., as well as denudes the sinner of moral responsibility.

It is remarkable that the Augustinian theory of depravity and sacramental regeneration set the whole Church upon believing that it was out of the question to save a dying infant without baptism; and even John Wesley could not rise above the dogma to deny it, but boldly affirmed that an infant dying unbaptized is "liable to eternal damnation." Notwithstanding, Wyclif, in the fourteenth century, had dared to contend against the hateful doctrine, but at great hazard

of persecution. But when the doctrine of *opus operatum* began to be obnoxious on account of the pernicious length to which the Romish Church carried it, and the logical involvement of infant damnation, sacramental regeneration lost ground. Then the doctrine of miraculous regeneration, independently of priest and all moral means, began to assert supremacy, and finally prevailed, for the most part, in Protestant countries.

This doctrine is not peculiar to Calvinists, but is held and urged, by all shades of Arminians, or such as adopt the Augustinian theory of the fall of man. That some of both parties may occasionally seem to hold a modified view of conversion, arises from the fact that, if they still hold the old theory of depravity, the logic of the heart, for the time being, triumphs over that of the head.

We do not intend to discuss here the doctrine of the foregoing quotations, but to lay the basis for the development of another view of conversion. But we wish now to call attention, especially, to the fact that, according to authors cited, regeneration is a miracle. This is boldly affirmed by some, among whom is Dr Pressensé, of Paris; but because there is difference in the definition of a miracle, some have denied. Whatever may be the definition, these quotations settle, beyond dispute, that if the original creation of man as a holy being was a miracle, then regeneration is a miracle in the same sense. Beyond this we care not to controvert.

TEACHING OF THE DISCIPLES.

The Disciples, vulgarly called Campbellites, without attempting to formulate a speculative system of theology, and not being able or willing to subscribe to any such system, have been generally inclined to avoid speculation in religion, choosing rather to confine themselves to the leadings of the holy oracles, interpreted by the same laws applied to any other written documents. But in projecting the "current Reformation" they found themselves confronted with the necessity of disputing every inch of the ground with the champions of the various religious systems of the day.

They went right at the work of preaching the Gospel, postulating that the sinner had the power, under the revealed provisions of Divine grace, to believe and obey. They held him responsible for failure or refusal, denouncing the wrath of God against the unbelieving

and disobedient. No sooner did they thus proceed, than the cry came from sinners on all sides, who had been under the influence of the various speculative systems: "We can not do any thing until God enables us by his irresistible grace." Here was a practical difficulty in the way. What must be done? Nothing could be done until these pernicious notions were undone. The people must be set at liberty from their chains. Hence, much of their earlier preaching and writing was in negation of the popular error on conversion. At this point, and some others, their work necessarily assumed the iconoclastic form. Destruction, not construction, was the work of the pioneers.

The postulate concerning the sinner's ability to believe and obey the Gospel without an irresistible power compelling, at once drew upon them the *odium theologicum*. They were not sound on the dominant, so-called, orthodox theory of human depravity. They replied that it was enough for them to know Jesus had commanded to "preach the Gospel to every creature;" and that "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned."

Surely, they said, man can believe when he hears, or else God is unjust to condemn him who does not believe. But the opponents said, they can not believe without the Holy Spirit, by an almighty power, regenerates them—extends the effectual call. "This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone; not from any thing at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Ghost, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it."

Out of this state of things sprang up a long controversy as to the question of regeneration or conversion,—how it must be effected; the Disciples contending that man, although suffering the consequences of Adamic sin, was yet a moral agent, to be converted by the moral power of the Spirit of God exerted through, by, or with the moral arguments or motives of the truth, the divine Word; that conversion is a moral change, effected by moral, not by "physical" power; that it is not a miracle.

They were met by charges that they denied the agency of the Holy Spirit in conversion; that they denied the divinity and personality of the Spirit: that they relied on the "mere word," the "cold black-letter," to convert sinners,—*et id omne genus*. Such an out-

burst of popular fury and persecution seldom ever was known since the days of inquisitorial atrocities. But, all around, motions to reconsider are now floating on the air.

Dr. Rice, in his debate with Alexander Campbell, revived the old cry in regard to denying the present efficient agency of the Spirit in conversion. This charge he attempted to establish by a long quotation from one of Mr. Campbell's early publications. The material parts of the passage are as follows :

"Every spirit puts forth its moral power in words ; that is, all the power it has over the views, habits, manners, or actions of men, is in the meaning and arrangements of its ideas, expressed in words, or in significant signs addressed to the eye or ear. All the moral power of Cicero and Demosthenes was in their orations when spoken, and in the circumstances which gave them meaning ; and whatever power these men have exercised over Greece and Rome since their death, is in their writings. . . . As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power in the words which it fills with its ideas, so the Spirit of God puts forth all its converting and sanctifying power in the words which it fills with its ideas. . . . We plead that all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the Divine Record." (Christianity Restored, pp. 350, 351.—A Dialogue.)

The argument based upon this passage was, that the Scriptures were placed in the same plane with the orations of Cicero and Demosthenes. Therefore, inasmuch as the spirits of these orators are not, in any efficient way, now present with their orations, neither is the Spirit of God a present, efficient agency in converting sinners through the Word of God. Mr. Campbell denied the sequence, as follows :

"Fellow-citizens, from all the premises before my mind, I conclude that the Spirit of truth—that omnipresent, animating Spirit of our God—whose sword or instrument this book is, is always present in the work of conversion, and through this truth changes the sinner's affections, and draws out his soul to God. It is, therefore, doing us an act of the greatest injustice, to represent us as comparing the Bible to the writings of any dead or absent man, in this point of comparison.

In some points of view, all books are alike ; but in other points of view, they are exceedingly dissimilar. In comparison, of all other books the Bible is superlatively a book *sui generis*. Its author not only ever lives, but is ever present in it, and with it, *operating through it, by it, and with it* upon saints and sinners." (Campbell and Rice's Debate, page 732.)

For the purpose of denial, these words are sufficiently explicit ; nevertheless, candor compels us to say that they are not satisfactory upon the question, How does the Spirit operate through the Word or truth ? And, although Dr. Rice pressed this question, he was

never able to bring his opponent to any thing definite. On account of this fact, and under the circumstances, the somewhat unfortunate comparison of the Scriptures with the orations of Cicero and Demosthenes, it is not passing strange that the advocates of miraculous regeneration, in order to uphold a falling theory, should overlook the real point in the comparison, and impute to Mr. Campbell and his coadjutors, by means of a logical process, a denial of the present efficient or active agency of the Holy Spirit in conversion. Indeed, he was so occupied in the negation of the "Spirit-impact" theory, and so fearful of the speculative, that it may be doubted, without disrespect, that he fully appreciated the importance of answering the question, How? or the self-imposed, logical requirement of his strong assertion upon this subject. Possibly, he had not fully grasped the relation of the Spirit to the truth in conversion, although he was remarkably clear as to sanctification. Still, some of his paragraphs evidently contain the germ of the true conception, and it is matter of regret that he did not fully develop it with his own masterly hand.

If his opponents urged that, notwithstanding his disclaimers, his arguments logically involved the "Word-alone" theory, they are not entirely without excuse, since some of his supporting scribes have occasionally written what seems very like it.

THE "WORD-ALONE" THEORY.

A few years since, one of the ablest men among the Disciples promulgated the following proposition: *As far as conversion is traceable to an influence not human, neither Providential, it is traceable to the truth, and to that alone.* (Lard's Quarterly, Vol. I, page 134.)

Of course, this proposition takes for granted the Holy Spirit's authorship of the truth; and, hence, that conversion is efficiently caused by the Spirit. That it was in the mind of the writer to argue the sufficiency of moral power in the Scriptures without an attendant agency of the Spirit, seems apparent from the following language, page 135:

"For, educate a man and give him the Bible, his conversion is then practicable, though he should never afterward see a human face or hear a human voice."

We say nothing in denial of this statement; for it would be difficult to regard it as any thing but an unsupported assertion. Such a

case of conversion would evidently be extraordinary; and if it could be shown that such a conversion had ever occurred, the fact would have no effect in fixing the standing rule. That the normal method would involve such a procedure seems utterly irreconcilable with the apostolic utterance, "That it hath pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save those who believe." If this extraordinary case is typical of a "practicable" method for converting the world, then we might better transform the Church into a Bible publishing and distributing society, and send school-teachers, instead of missionaries, to the heathen; and if such teachers were not Christians at all, the practicability of the plan would not be jeopardized. Is not this the "Word-alone" theory in its most objectionable form? It is, indeed, placing the Bible in the same plane with the orations of Cicero and Demosthenes, which Mr. Campbell plainly did not.

FALSE ANALOGIES.

A favorable illustration with some preachers, to show the Spirit's relation to conversion through the Word, runs thus: They portray a person deeply affected to sorrow or joy by the contents of a letter from some friend. Then they triumphantly ask, "What exercised the reader so but the spirit of the writer operating through the words of the letter? Certainly the writer's spirit did not go out of himself to prepare, or to infuse a new principle into, the mind of the reader, or to quicken his sensibilities." If the object of this illustration were to show that one spirit can operate through words upon another, it would be proper enough; but nobody denies this. The present agency of the Spirit in conversion, being admitted, how does He operate through divine truth as the spirits of Cicero and Demosthenes can not now operate through their orations, they being "dead or absent?"

Such illustrations are delusive, and subject the Disciples to the charge of believing the "Word-alone" theory; besides, they utterly fail to involve and present the Scriptural idea of conversion.

THE TRUE CONCEPTION AS A GERM.

At the close of the dialogue from which Mr. Rice quoted to prove that Mr. Campbell denied any present agency in conversion, Mr.

Campbell lets go his moorings from his prime object of exposing the falsity of the "Spirit-impact" theory, and sweeps out into a wider view of the relation of the Spirit to the sinner's conversion, as follows :

"But that the Spirit of God may operate upon the unbelieving and disobedient, let us approach them with the Spirit in our hearts, with the words of the Spirit upon our tongues, and with the holiness of the Spirit in our lives." (*Christianity Restored*, page 379.)

Here he struck the right note. This is the truth upon the relation of the Spirit's agency in conversion, in germinal form.

Upon the subject of sanctification, he wrote thus :

"Christians are, therefore, clearly and unequivocally, temples of the Holy Spirit; and they are quickened, animated, encouraged, and sanctified by the power and influence of the Spirit of God, working in them through the truth." (*Chris. System*, page 66.)

"Working in them through the truth" for their sanctification. How? "By helping our infirmities, comfortiug us by seasonably bringing to our remembrance the promises of Christ, and strengthens with all might in the inner man."

If the Spirit of God thus carries on the work of sanctification in saints, working in them through the truth, why not work in them through the truth for the conversion of sinners? Truly, if we approach the unbelieving and disobedient with the Spirit of God in our hearts, and with the words of the Spirit upon our tongues, and with the holiness of the Spirit in our lives, we may not only expect conversions to result, but we may demonstrate practically, that the Spirit of God works in us through the truth to regenerate men, not in a miraculous way, but according to an established order, and harmoniously with the laws of our mental and moral constitution.

For the very reason that God would reach the unbelieving heart by his Spirit, not in a miraculous way, but through the truth, by the impressment of human thought, feeling, and affection into his service, he originated the Church, with her ministry, as a divine institution. He made every Christian a temple for his Spirit, and every congregation "is builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit, that unto him should be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end."

In view of this result the apostle exhorts the Ephesians to "be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but to be filled with the

Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." There are two channels through which excitant influences may reach every man,—the fleshly and spiritual natures. Those who live according to the flesh, live under the control and direction of carnal appetites and passions, as the heathen who engage in wild bacchanalian orgies under the frenzying power of wine, doubtless placed in the text as a type of sensual influences; but the Christian, walking not after the flesh, but after the dictates of his spiritual nature, which should ever be kept *en rapport* with the Spirit of God, may be animated in the service and worship of God by the divine Spirit. The fellowship of the Spirit is indispensable to growth and usefulness. Hence, God says, "Draw nigh to me, and I will draw nigh to you;" "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man [Christian] hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me."

What is this but the blessed promise of Spirit-communion with God, conditioned upon our willingness. Again, Jesus said, "If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them [children] that ask him?" Hence, "to be filled with the Spirit" is put in the imperative mood with good reason. This command ought not to prompt a quibbling justification of spiritual barrenness and inefficiency; but rather a deep lament and mournful confession of disobedience in failing or refusing to open wide the heart's door to the waiting, heavenly visitor.

NEGLECT OF THE WORD.

The manifest tendency with those who expect the Holy Spirit to regenerate the sinner independently of the truth, is to neglect its unfolding to his mind and heart, and to resolve their efforts into prayer for a result, which, under God, they ought to be active in securing. The "Word-alone" theorist deems it all important to preach a very rhetorical and logical Gospel, depending upon the truth unsupported by any power from the indwelling Spirit of God, either in himself or the Church, to convert the sinner. Thus, in case of both, the Word is neglected. With the latter, the Gospel, too often, becomes simply a projectile urged by mere brain-force against

opposing brain buttressed by a wicked and unyielding heart. There is no spiritual unction in its utterance; no accompanying re-enforcing power. Hence, too much preaching in our day degenerates into mere intellectual entertainment; a feast of reason, but no flow of soul. Converts made by such preaching are apt to manifest a form of religion, if it may be called so, which is a thing of intellection simply. There is no breaking down of the moral nature under a crushing sense of sin and need of a Savior. They simply join the Church.

How unlike all this is the brief but comprehensive description of a Scriptural preacher and his converts: "Barnabas was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, and much people was added to the Lord." (Acts xi, 24.)

It is not presumable that Barnabas indulged in arguments or motives different from, or additional to, those we now find in the divine Record; but doubtless the Holy Spirit, as an indwelling presence and power, mellowed his sympathies, sharpened his spiritual intuitions, mightily strengthened his inner man, and thus assisted him to speak effectively the right thing in the right place, and at the right time. It is not sufficient that a physician may be able to survey at a glance the entire *materia medica*; in order to success, he must be shrewd in diagnosis, and exercise skill and sound judgment in prescribing the appropriate remedy. Right under the eyes of spiritual doctors many a man's case has*proved fatal, out of sheer exhaustion from struggling in the toils of Supralapsarianism or Sublapsarianism or Arminianism (these toils only multiplied by the preacher's efforts to prove one or another system true or false), while a good round dose of conviction for sin would have been an effectual curative.

If the Holy Spirit, working in us through the truth, "timely bringing to our remembrance" such portions of the divine Word as may be suitable to our present wants, and otherwise helping on our sanctification, why may not the same Spirit, in the same methods, re-enforce the truth upon our tongues, and utilize every power of our nature to give it force and effect in the work of conversion? Thus David seemed to feel. Hear his earnest pleading while struggling up out of the terrible consciousness of his sin: "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right Spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from

me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free Spirit. Then will I teach transgressors thy ways, and sinners shall be converted unto thee." (Ps. li.)

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN GOOD AND EVIL.

The nature of the conflict between light and darkness, God and Satan, "the Prince of the power of the air, the Spirit that now works in the children of disobedience," gives not only possibility, but a high degree of probability, if not certainty, to the active agency of the Holy Spirit as now set forth. The Scriptural view of Demonology evidently ascribes to Satan, as the chief of evil spirits, an internal and efficacious power for evil over man's mental and moral nature. This power was so remarkable in some instances that the possessed seemed to speak and act under a sort of double consciousness, as in the case of the Gadarene, and other demoniacs. If such power was manifest, the lesser degree of power involved in internal promptings, impulses, and temptations to evil, is not to be denied. The utilization of all the faculties of the children of disobedience in tempting others to evil, in the perversion of truth and the dissemination of error, seem clearly ascribed in the Bible to the "father of lies." Paul's denunciation of Elymas, the sorcerer,—Acts xiii, 8-10—is in point here: "O full of all subtilty and all mischief, *thou child of the devil*, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to *pervert* the right ways of the Lord?" Elymas was the child of the devil, because the spirit of all evil animated and encouraged him in his opposition to the truth. It is also remarkable that the narrative represents Paul as "filled with the Holy Spirit" when he launched the thunder-bolt of divine wrath upon this child of the devil. Why this, but to indicate the method of the contest between God and Satan? On the one hand arrayed was Paul, "filled with the Holy Spirit," attempting the conversion of Sergius Paulus, through the word of God; and on the other, Elymas, filled by the evil spirit, trying, through his arts of sophistry, to "turn away the deputy from the faith." It is no answer to say that Paul was an apostle; therefore, he was filled with the Holy Spirit; for surely it could not have been the design of Luke to tell us in this place that Paul was simply an inspired man. Beside, Barnabas and many others were filled with the Holy Spirit, to whom apostolic office and dignity did not pertain.

A MORAL CHANGE.

If, to overcome the sinner's inherited or acquired enmity to God, not only motives and arguments suitable to change his thoughts, feelings, and affections may be addressed to his understanding, the change once effected would be no less a moral one; because those who utter the truth may be filled with the Holy Spirit, He working in them through the truth to effect the proposed end. And conversion being thus effected by the agency of the Holy Spirit, with the sub-agency of the child of God, and the instrumentality of the truth, must be regarded, not as a change wrought by "physical" power, but by moral power exerted through moral means—motives and arguments—hence, not a miracle in any proper sense of the word. Therefore, the sinner, being brought into proper relations to the truth and Spirit of God, or into such position as makes these relations possible, is morally responsible for his conversion; for, although he may resist the Spirit of God, as did the Jews by rejecting the counsel of God, he may also yield to the divine strivings.

If the Spirit animating the children of obedience were only the equal in power of the Spirit animating the children of disobedience, and the resources and numbers of each contending host were equal, the conflict might be continued forever. But truth is infinitely more powerful than error; and wherever the conflict between Satan and the Divine Spirit has been directly waged, the victory has always been with the latter. Besides, over all and overruling all, there is what we call Divine Providence, steadily shaping and leading to the final issue. If it were a question simply of abstract power, the contest would end in a moment. But this conflict is one of moral forces. It must be continued and concluded with a constant reference to those moral laws which God has impressed upon his responsible creatures. In this matter, God has obliged himself. The issue may be long in suspense, but never in doubt. "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but [moral] mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strongholds, casting down reasonings [Satan's logic], and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge [truth] of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the

rulers of the darkness of this world, against wicked spirits in the heavenly regions."

THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT.

Having thus indicated the nature of the conflict, the apostle proceeds to describe the Christian's armor, with which he is to withstand the wiles of the devil. The last item of the armor noted is an aggressive weapon, "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." Is the Word of God the sword of the Spirit, simply because he inspired and confirmed it by miracle? Because it was forged in the furnace of inspiration, is this alone the reason that it is the sword of the Spirit? And having thus forged it, did he hurl it into the world to cut its way through the hearts of the king's enemies by the force of one original, undiminishing impulse? Or is it his sword, for the additional reason that he now strengthens the Christian arm which wields it? Some appear to regard it a very good sword; but when the Christian warrior engages the sinner, he can only smite effectually after the Spirit of God has gone before into the sinner's heart, and softened it by a regenerative act; then he can use the sword to purpose. That is, after the sinner is conquered, use the sword on him; or, after he is killed, kill him. Or, as if one sent to chop down a hard-wood tree should wait for the application of a chemical to soften the wood, rather than nerve his arm to intensify the blow sufficiently to overcome the hardness. No, no; the Spirit having formed the sword, commands the Christian to use it, saying, "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." "I will be in you to help your infirmities, to strengthen you with all might in the inner man, to intensify the blow upon the sinner's heart till he cry for mercy." Thus God's "Word is like a fire, and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces."

It is not a valid objection to the view herein set forth, that the moral ideas or motives of the Gospel are the same, whether read or proclaimed by the living voice, although the proclaimer may possess the Spirit of God. Motives, to be effective, must be weighed and considered by the person to be affected. "He who would move others, must himself first be moved;" or, the ideas and motives which he would impress upon others for their conversion, must be made a part of his own consciousness. Then they may issue from

the heart to the heart. What true preacher of Christ that has not enjoyed the sweet consciousness of the helpful presence of the Divine Spirit in his most successful ministrations of the glorious Gospel of the blessed God? And how often, on the other hand, has he felt a sort of moral paralysis from the want of that communion of Spirit which pervades every faculty with its delicious soul-elevating and quickening influence?

Not alone should the preacher be filled with the Spirit, but the Church also; since it is the duty of all Christians to bear the truth to a dying world. "Let him that heareth say, Come." God will honor his message on the lips of the humblest disciple. Not unfrequently have the earnest, faithful, and affectionate pleadings of the weakest saints contributed incalculably to the conversion of multitudes. The Church is the pillar and foundation of the truth. If the Church be "sensual, having not the Spirit," the preacher always finds his work hindered. Before he can convert the world, he must convert the Church. The sun's ray will not germinate a seed if an intervening iceberg has absorbed its heat.

Perfectly in accord with this view of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the sinner in conversion are the Scriptures, which ascribe conversion in one place directly to God, in another to the Spirit or to the Christian or to the truth. Paul to the Corinthians: "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel." James: "Of his [God's] own will begat he us by the word of truth." Paul to Phil-emon: "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds." John: "But as many as received him to them gave he privilege to become the children of God, even to them that believed on his name, who were born [begotten] not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God. Again: "Ye must be born again." "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Paul to Titus: "Not by works of righteousness that we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." James: "Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall," etc.

Conversion, from all the foregoing considerations, seems to be of God by the Holy Spirit dwelling in the children of God, and operating upon the sinner through the truth.

As to those who do not possess the written revelation of truth, we affirm not nor deny, except that, so far as we know, no one has ever been converted to faith in Christ without the Gospel. That many heathens are converted from wickedness to goodness of conduct is undoubtedly true. That they possess divine truth in fragmentary forms, and that even occasional gleams of Gospel light thwart their moral darkness, may be safely believed. How far and to what extent the Spirit of God, in the unsearchable ways of divine providence, may use the truth they do possess, is not a subject for present consideration. It is our object to consider the normal method of conversion. While we are safe in affirming affirmations which are clearly taught in the Word of God, it is not wise nor logical to affirm negatives.

PRACTICAL RESULTS.

If the view we now contend for were fully accorded, it is very evident that the Word of God would be far more valued, studied, and conscientiously used as an instrument for conversion. Christians would be active in accomplishing the conversion of sinners, and not simply given to prayer for God to work miracles. Again: With those who fully recognize the instrumentality of truth, there would be more reliance upon divine assistance, with a more continuous effort to keep themselves in such moral condition and attitude that they might be used by the Holy Spirit as a presence and power within to vitalize the truth upon their tongues and in their lives, to the end that sinners should fall down upon their faces worshipping God, and report that God is in them of a truth.

While thus piety would be quickened, prayer would receive a new inspiration. He who depends upon the Spirit alone to convert, may be exceedingly prayerful; but it is at the expense of personal activity and consecration to the work which God has laid upon him. He who depends upon the word alone, will not likely become prayerful for a result which he regards as humanly caused. But he who realizes that conversion is an effect secured under the operation of natural laws, but by a supernatural cause within himself, operating through the truth upon his tongue—a supernatural instrument—will most likely work as well as pray; but he will pray the more, the more he realizes his own inefficiency without the internal help of

the Divine Spirit. And the more he experiences the enriching power of the Spirit in the quickening of his own spiritual intuitions, and in the fertilization of his own spiritual nature, the more he will pray. Although conversion may appear to result, as it ever does, from the sinner's apprehension of the truth, yet the pious will inevitably run back by faith through the entire chain of causation, natural and supernatural, until he formulates his conception in those words of Paul, which, although they originally referred to apostles only, nevertheless are capable in principle of wider application: "We have this treasure [the Gospel] in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."

"Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and the power of his might."

III.—ΤΟ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.—THE GOOD NEWS.

FEW words, of such frequent use as is the Gospel, are so little understood. In its current use, it covers all the modifications of Catholicism and Protestantism. Each sect calls its own doctrine the Gospel, and the doctrines of all the others heresies, false doctrines, or dangerous errors.

There is a wide difference between Gospel and doctrine—between good doctrine and the Gospel. For, a doctrine, however true, is not Gospel; much less the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Catholicism, as it exists in the Greek and Roman Churches, teaches much that is not taught by the authoritative proclaimers of the Gospel; and the same is true of Protestantism. Catholics are divided among themselves, as, the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, and the Old Catholic. The Protestants are also divided against themselves; and thus we are furnished with the conflicting variety of what is called, "The Christian Denominations," all of which are not only unknown to the apostolic times, but exist in open violation of the law of God, which says: "Let there be no divisions among you."

A clear conception of the import of the words, "The Gospel of Jesus Christ," and a disposition to accept it, instead of the doctrines

and theories which now distinguish "the Christian Denominations," will do much toward a recovery of the disciples of Jesus from the dominion of party, and collecting them into one body, animated by one Spirit, and having but "one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all." To this end the following facts are presented:

1. The Gospel is not a doctrine. Though doctrine (from the Latin *doctrina*, which is from *doctor*, a teacher) may mean instruction, in its primary sense; yet that is not the general sense, or the sense generally attached to the word. It means, a body of principles; a tenet, or any opinion or principle which any one holds, or maintains, as true.

2. It is not a theory. Theory, from the Greek (*θεωρεῖα*, from *θεωρεῖν*, to look at) word from which we derive it, means, a speculation; an exposition of the general principles of any science; science distinguished from art; a philosophical explanation of phenomena. The theory of religion is a speculation; an exposition of some general principles relative to God and men, as it regards the relations existing between them. A theological theory, however correct, is not the Gospel.

3. Neither Catholicism nor Protestantism; Calvinism nor Arminianism; Unitarianism nor Trinitarianism; Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, nor *any thing peculiar* to either of them, is the Gospel of Christ. The Gospel, as such, has no connection with either of them, but is entirely different from them all.

4. Gospel is never, in the Scriptures, used to qualify, restrict the meaning of, nor to explain any other word; as, "Gospel truth," "Gospel ordinances," "Gospel dispensation," "Gospel plan," etc.

5. The Greek word (*εὐαγγέλιον*) which we translate Gospel, is, in the classics and New Testament, used in a secondary sense. Primarily, it meant *the reward of good tidings* given to the messenger. It subsequently took the sense of *good news, good tidings*; and, with the article (*τὸ*), *the good news, the good tidings*. It is used in the New Testament in a special, but not in a peculiar sense. The special sense will be noticed soon.

6. Sometimes, though rarely, the verb (*εὐαγγελίζω*, and the middle form *εὐαγγελίζομαι*) is used, which includes the sense of the noun. Luke i, 19: "I am Gabriel, who stands in the presence of God; and I was sent to speak to thee, and *to bring thee these good tidings*." Luke ii, 10: "Fear not; for behold, I bring you *good tidings* of great

joy, which shall be to all the people." Gal. iii, 8: "The Scripture foreseeing that God justifies the nations by faith, preannounced *good news* to Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all the nations be blessed."

7. More frequently the noun (εὐαγγέλιον) is used with the transitive verb (κηρύσσω), which governs it in the accusative case. The verb means, *to announce, to publish*: sometimes, to give the first notice, and sometimes, the most extensive notice.

8. The special sense of the noun, in which it is used in the New Testament, is, *the good news*, which the common version renders by "the Gospel." While "Gospel" retained its etymological sense a better translation could not have been made, it having been derived from the Anglo-Saxon, *godespell*, which meant good tidings.

News and doctrine; news and tenet; news and theory, are very different things. A doctrine, a tenet, a theory may be *new*; but not *news*; the former meaning, of late origin; recently invented, discovered, or established as true; and the latter, recent account, fresh information. This word conveys, always, the idea of account, information; but "new," that of origin, discovery, or establishment. A difference exists between good doctrine, good tenet, and good theory, and good news. The word good being added to all the words leaves them in the same relation to each other.

The New Testament never designates the Gospel (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) doctrine (διδασκαλία) *teaching, instruction, education, training*; nor (διδασκῆ, διδάσκεις), *teaching*. The doctrine of the Gospel, and the doctrines of the Gospel, are expressions which excite little attention, because of their familiarity; but if we attached the Scriptural idea to the word Gospel, the case is very different. The doctrine of the news, or the doctrines of the news, and the doctrines of the good news, are expressions which would excite immediate attention, because of their absurdity.

9. The phrase, good news, is indefinite; and is equally applicable to any good news. But the phrase, *the good news*, designates some particular good news. That is the subject of our present investigation. Our standard dictionary gives the sense of our word Gospel, as in common use, very accurately, thus: "(1.) The good news concerning Christ and his salvation; (2.) One of the historical narratives of the life and sayings of Jesus Christ; (3.) Any system of religious

truth." This is *our* usage, and not that of the Scriptures. As the author was writing an English Dictionary, and not a Scripture Dictionary, it was proper that he should give the sense required by English usage.

But we are concerned with the New Testament usage. What is that? The kingdom of heaven, having been proclaimed by John the Baptizer as having approached, was an expression familiar to the people. The word (εὐαγγέλιον) Gospel, or good news, is first mentioned in connection with that kingdom, thus: "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom." "And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom." (Matt. iv, 23; ix, 35.) *This, and not another* Gospel, was designed for *all the nations*. "And this good news of the kingdom shall be proclaimed *in all the world*, for a testimony to *all* (τοῖς ἔθνεσι) *the nations*," etc. "Verily, I say to you, wherever this good news shall be proclaimed *in all the world*, this also that she did shall be told, for a memorial of her." (Matt. xxiv, 14; xxvi, 13.) These are all the passages in which the word is found in Matthew. The fact that this good news was for *all the nations* is further shown by Mark xiii, 10. Jesus told the disciples that they would be delivered up to councils, and be beaten in synagogues, and brought before governors and kings for his sake for a testimony to them; and added, "And the good news must first be proclaimed *among all the nations*." We call special attention to this fact, that whatever this good news was, it was the Gospel for all the nations—for "every creature." Whatever good news may have been added to it, as confirmative of it, as the death of Jesus for our sins, and his resurrection for our justification, as in 1 Cor. xv, 1-4, does not change this, nor annul it. It still remains the Gospel of the kingdom, and the good news for all the nations. Paul preached to the Jews in Corinth, testifying that Jesus is the Christ; and, as he says in the above passage, that he died for our sins, was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures. This was good news, because it confirmed "the good news of the kingdom"—the Gospel, which was to be preached to every creature. The fact that Jesus died for our sins, was buried, and rose again, although good news, is never called the good news of the kingdom of God, of which it was confirmatory. Gabriel, who was

sent to announce the fact that a son should be born to Zachariah who should be great before the Lord, be filled with Holy Spirit, turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God, go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a prepared people for the Lord, says that he was sent to "bring these glad tidings." But this is not the glad tidings or good news of the kingdom of God. The annunciation that a Savior was born in the city of David, who was Christ the Lord, was good news; but not *the Gospel* of the kingdom of God. Paul said to the Jews in Antioch, "And we declare to you good news of the promise made to the fathers, that God has fulfilled this to their children in raising Jesus." When Isaiah said to Zion, "Thy God reigns! Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion," it is called bringing "good tidings of peace," and "glad tidings of good things." But this is not "the good news of the kingdom." Paul says to the Thessalonians, "But now, when Timothy came to us from you, and brought us good tidings of your faith and love," etc. This was good news; but not "the good news of the kingdom of God," nor "the good news of Jesus Christ, Son of God."

10. But there is a message which is called "the good news of Jesus Christ." To this we now call attention; and we will begin with the beginning. "The beginning of the good news of Jesus Christ, Son of God, as it is written in Isaiah the prophet: "Behold, I send forth my messenger before thy face who shall prepare thy way; the voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord; make straight his paths." This is the prophecy concerning the beginning of the good news. The next sentence furnishes the fulfillment: "*John came baptizing in the wilderness, and publishing the baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins.*" The proclamation of pardon is, to a sinner, the best news. This is "the good news of the kingdom" which was to "be proclaimed in all the world, for a witness to all the nations." So said Jesus before his death; and he repeated the same thing after his resurrection. He said to his disciples: "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and should rise from the dead on the third day; and that *repentance and forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed* (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ) upon his

name among all the nations, beginning in Jerusalem. Ye are witnesses of these things." (Luke xxiv, 47, 48.)

John, who from his occupation, was afterward called the Baptist, was the first who preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and his proclamation is, therefore, called *the beginning* of the good news of Jesus Christ. He was born in the days of Herod, the King of Judea. His father was a priest, and his mother was of the daughters of Aaron, the brother of Moses, the law-giver of the children of Israel. He was religiously reared; for his parents were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. They were far advanced in years, and had lived without children till all hope of such a blessing had long since vanished.

While this venerable priest was burning incense as he was entering into the temple of the Lord, and the whole multitude of the people were praying without, he saw an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense. The angel quieted the fears excited by his presence, and told Zachariah that the prayer he had offered for a son was heard, and that his wife should bear a son, and they should call his name John.

Of this child the angel said: "He shall be great before the Lord; and he shall not drink wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with (πνεύματος ἁγίου) Holy Spirit, even from his birth. And many of the sons of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready a prepared people for the Lord."

His father, at the time of his circumcision, was filled with Holy Spirit, and prophesied of his future, saying: "And thou, O child, shall be called Prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways, in order to give knowledge of salvation to his people in remission of their sins, through the tender mercies of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high visited us, to give light to those sitting in darkness and the shadow of death, in order to guide our feet into the way of peace."

Jesus says of this noble young man who had been "sent from God:" "He was the burning and shining lamp." "What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken by the wind? But what went ye out to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they

who wear soft clothing are in king's houses. But what went ye out to see? A Prophet? Yes, I say to you, and more than a prophet. For this is he of whom it is written, "Behold, I send forth (τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, *my angel*;) my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. Verily, I say unto you, among those born of women, there has not risen a greater than John the Baptizer. But he who is least [Jesus himself, who was among the disciples as one who served] is greater than he. And from the days of John the Baptizer until now, the kingdom of heaven is suffering violence, and the violent are seizing upon it; for all the prophets and the law prophesied until John. And, if ye will receive it, he is the Elijah who should come."

The first proclaimer of the Gospel of Jesus is called, by the Evangelist, "*The beginning of the good news of Jesus Christ, Son of God.*" "The law and the prophets were, until John" commenced preaching the kingdom of heaven. The first sentence of his preaching, as recorded by Matthew, is, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven (ἤγγικε, third person, singular, perfect, indicative of ἔγγιζε) *has approached.*" He preached neither the law nor the prophets. Moses was preached in the synagogues every Sabbath-day, but not by John. The same is true of the prophets. So far as the record shows, he never quoted a passage from the law, and but one from the prophets; and that was the one which referred to his own mission. When the Word of God came to the son of Zachariah, in the wilderness, the law and the prophets gave way to the Gospel of the kingdom. He was the herald of Jesus, and proclaimed a kingdom which had superseded both the law and the prophet.

He at first told the people to believe on one who was coming after him; and subsequently told them that Jesus was that one. No man ever identified Jesus more clearly than did John. He "came to bear witness of the light [Jesus], that through him all might believe." "John bore witness of him, and cried, saying: This was he of whom I said, He who is coming after me is preferred before me, because he was before me. Because, out of his fullness have we all received, and grace for grace. For the law was given through Moses; the grace and the truth came through Jesus Christ. No one has ever seen God. The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him."

When he was baptizing in Bethany, beyond the Jordan, the Jews sent priests and Levites to him, who said to him: "Who art thou?" He told them that he was not the Christ nor Elijah nor the Prophet; but that he was the voice of one crying in the wilderness: "Make straight the way of the Lord." The Pharisees then asked why he baptized, if he was neither of these. He replied: "I baptize in water. There is one standing in the midst of you, whom ye know not; he who is coming after me; the latchet of whose sandal I am not worthy to loose."

The next day he saw Jesus coming to him, and said: "Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world." This is Gospel good news,—good news of Jesus Christ. John recognized and proclaimed him as the great sacrificial victim who was to die for our sins. He said that he had not known him, "but that he might be made manifest to Israel; for this I came, baptizing in water." He "proclaimed the baptism of repentance *for remission of sins*," in the name of one who was coming after him, that he might be manifest to Israel as *the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world*. He who sent John to baptize in water, had told him that he on whom he should see the Spirit descending and remaining, or abiding on him, the same was he who baptizes in Holy Spirit. John had seen and borne witness that Jesus was the Son of God. And, looking on Jesus as he was walking, he repeated his proclamation: "Behold the Lamb of God."

In the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, John proclaimed Jesus of Nazareth as the coming one, the Christ, the Son of God, and the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world. He said of him: "He must increase, but I must decrease. He who comes from above is above all: he who is from the earth is of the earth, and speaks of the earth; but He who comes from heaven is above all. And what he has seen and heard, that he testifies; and his testimony no one receives. He who received his testimony has set his seal that God is true. For he whom God sent forth speaks the words of God; for God gives not the Spirit by measure. The Father loves the Son, *and has given all things into his hand. He who believes on the Son has everlasting life; and he who believes not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abides on him.*"

John did not preach the resurrection of Jesus from the dead,

because he had not yet died. But he intimated the fact that he would rise, when, after proclaiming him as the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world, he said that the Father had given all things into his hand, and that whoever believed on him had everlasting life, which is the "gift of God *through Jesus Christ our Lord.*" How could he give eternal life, if he did not rise from the dead? But it was premature to publish, as a present fact, what had not yet transpired.

The law and the prophets, which were until John, had never announced "the baptism of repentance for remission of sins." This was "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, God's Son," as shown from the first chapter of Mark; and it has never been superseded by any thing else. The additional facts which accumulated in the eventful life of Jesus, were confirmatory of the Gospel as preached by John; and not intended as abrogatory of the good news which he proclaimed.

The writer of the Acts of Apostles informs us that Apollos, the eloquent Alexandrian Jew, was instructed in the way of the Lord Jesus, and that he taught the way of Jesus (*ἀκριβῶς*) *accurately or correctly*, without knowing any thing more than the baptism of John. At the time this account was written, it is assumed by some who deny John's baptism, no one could teach the way of Jesus *correctly* without teaching people that they should be "baptized *in the name of Jesus.*" If this is true, then Apollos taught people so; for *he* taught the way of Jesus "correctly." But if correct teaching is ascribed to Apollos in the year of our Lord fifty-six, and his teaching included no more than what is included in the expression, "the baptism of John," we see no reason why any one who teaches only what Apollos taught, should not be accounted a correct teacher now. Could any one teach the way of the Lord correctly at the time Apollos taught in Ephesus, and not teach his death, his resurrection, and his universal Lordship? If not, then he taught these things; for he taught "correctly."

The baptism of John was the same, whether preached before or after the resurrection; and whether preached by John before he knew that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, and the Lamb of God; and whether preached by himself, by Jesus, by the apostles, by Apollos, or by any other person. It was "*the baptism of repentance*

for remission of sins," the only baptism enjoined in the New Testament, and every-where practiced by "the disciples of Jesus" at this time, to the great annoyance of the "Protestant Denominations."

Those who object, urge the fact that Aquila and Priscilla taught Apollos the way of the Lord more perfectly. This is impossible; for "he was instructed in the way of the Lord" Jesus, and "he spoke and taught *correctly the things concerning Jesus*, knowing only the baptism of John." How could he be taught more perfectly in what he himself taught correctly? The truth in the case is, that Aquila and Priscilla did not teach him the way of the Lord more perfectly; nor does the sacred historian so affirm. He says that they "expounded to him *the way of God* more perfectly;" not the way of Jesus, which he "taught correctly." Though an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures, he might still become mightier under competent teachers like those mentioned. The way of God in preparing, for centuries, the way for his Son, both by prophecy and types, was a great subject, and one to which Aquila and Priscilla had given more attention than Apollos had. He had devoted much attention to John, who was "more than a prophet," and who never quoted a prophecy to prove Jesus to be the Son of God and the Christ; but who *testified to what he himself had seen and heard*. These friends expounded the Old Testament Scriptures (not the Gospel) to him more perfectly; and, therefore, when he went from Ephesus into Achaia, he "contributed much to those who had believed through grace. For he powerfully confuted the Jews in public, showing *by the Scriptures* (not by John only) that Jesus is the Christ." We know many disciples who can teach correctly the things concerning Jesus, who might learn much more than they now know concerning the way of God.

While Apollos was in Corinth, Paul, having passed through the upper districts, came to Ephesus; and finding certain disciples, he said to them: "Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when ye believed? And they said to him: No; we did not even hear whether (πνευμα ἁγίων ἔστιν) *a Holy Spirit is* [received]. And he said to them: Into what then were you baptized? And they said: Into John's baptism. Then said Paul: John indeed baptized with the baptism of repentance; saying to the people, that they should believe on him who should come after him; that is, on Jesus. And when they heard, they

were baptized." "This," is not in the original. The question arises here: When who heard? The answer is: The people to whom John preached, including these disciples found in Ephesus. When they heard what? Just what Paul says John preached; namely, That the people should believe on him who was coming after him; that is, on Jesus. They were then baptized into John's baptism; and John's baptism was "the baptism of repentance for remission of sins;" and, as we have seen, it was the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, God's Son."

As the impression seems to be somewhat prevalent that John baptized very many people in many places before he baptized Jesus, a collection of the passages relating to these baptisms will aid us in ascertaining the accuracy of this view. To save the trouble of turning to the passages we will insert them here.

"I indeed baptize you (ἐν ὕδατι) in water into repentance: but he who is coming after me is mightier than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to bear: he will baptize you (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ) in the Holy Spirit and fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing-floor, and will gather his wheat into the garner; but the chaff he will burn up with fire unquenchable. Then comes Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan to John, to be baptized by him." (Matt. iii, 11-13.) This being all that refers to the *time* of the baptism of Jesus, when John had the revelation that he was the Son of God, we quote no farther from this Evangelist. The immersion of Jesus occurred at the time when people from Jerusalem and all parts of Judea came to the Jordan River to be immersed; but at what precise time is not stated; whether the same day of the first immersions, or the next day, if, indeed, any more than one day is alluded to. For all "Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region about the Jordan" can not be understood of *all the inhabitants* in those places; but must be understood of people *from all the places named*, as indicating how generally the people were moved by this distinguished minister of the Gospel of Jesus. This is evident from the fact that not *all*, but "*many* of the Pharisees and Sadducees came to his baptism," and that "the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not having been baptized by him;" and also that John and Jesus, by the agency of his disciples, baptized even more than came to John on the occasion above mentioned.

Mark says: "And there went out to him all the country of Judea, and all they of Jerusalem; and they were baptized by him in the Jordan River, confessing their sins. And John was clothed with camel's hair, and with a leathern girdle about his loins; and he ate locusts and wild honey. And he preached, saying: There comes after me he who is mightier than I, the latchet of whose sandals I am not worthy to stoop down and loose. I indeed immerse you in water; but he will immerse you in Holy Spirit. And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and (ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην) was immersed by John into the Jordan." (Mark i, 5-9.) The same remark that was made, relative to the statement of Matthew as regards the number baptized, is equally applicable here.

"I indeed immerse you in water; but there comes he who is mightier than I, the latchet of whose sandals I am not worthy to loose: he will immerse you in Holy Spirit and fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing-floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable." "Now it came to pass, when all the people had been immersed, that as Jesus, having also been immersed, was praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended in bodily shape as a dove upon him; and then came a voice out of heaven: Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." (Luke iii, 16, 17, 21, 22.) It is also certain that "all the people" here is to be interpreted as in Matthew and Mark, and for the same reasons. It is not certain, as has been inferred, that Jesus was not baptized till all the people here mentioned had been immersed. The statement is, that when all the people had been baptized Jesus was praying, he himself having also been baptized, whether before all the people were, or not, is not said. But this fact is apparent, that the meeting in which Jesus and so many people had been baptized was "closed by prayer" offered by Jesus; and that, as he was praying, the Holy Spirit pointed him out, and the Father proclaimed him, out of the parted heavens, his beloved son, in whom he was well pleased. For any thing that appears to the contrary, this was the first day on which John had baptized any one; and all those who were listening to his instructions, were reasoning in their hearts whether he himself were not the Christ. What more appropriate occasion could have been selected for the announcement of the Son of God?

While John was baptizing in Bethany beyond the Jordan, the Jews sent priests and Levites to him to inquire whether he was the Christ, or Elijah, or the prophet; and if not, why he was immersing. To their questions he replied in the order in which they were presented; and to the last one, he said: "I baptize in water. There is One standing in the midst of you whom ye know not, he who comes after me, the latchet of whose sandals I am not worthy to loose." "On the morrow," the very next day after this conversation with the priests and Levites, "he sees Jesus coming to him, and says: Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said [in the past tense], After me comes a man who is preferred before me; because he was before me, And I knew him not: but that he might be made manifest to Israel; for this I came baptizing in water. And John bear witness, saying: I have seen the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven, and it abode on him. And I knew him not; but he who sent me to baptize in water, the same said to me: Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding on him, the same is he who baptizes in Holy Spirit. And I have seen [something already done] and have borne witness [he had already testified] that this is the Son of God." He bore this testimony at a very early period of his ministry. Why should he not? He was sent to baptize, that Jesus might be made manifest to Israel. Why should Jesus not be made manifest on the very first baptismal occasion? Especially as the baptism was "for remission of sins," and he is "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world." Can any one tell why? Jesus had been identified by John before these priests and Levites came to him to know who he was. "The baptism of repentance for remission of sins" was "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, God's Son;" and why should he be concealed from the people for a long time after his baptism was preached for the express purpose of revealing him to Israel? The very remission which John preached was to come through the Lamb of God. In what way was Jesus made manifest to Israel *by John's baptism*, if that baptism was not preached as having him for its object? Paul said to the disciples in Ephesus, that John told the people to believe on Jesus—and so say the evangelists. And when they did believe on Jesus they were baptized in his name. Though it is not expressly stated by the evangelists, yet it appears that John baptized in the

name of Jesus ; not in the sense of a *formula*, but as having *reference to him as the object of this faith*. "The baptism of repentance for remission of sins" was the beginning of his Gospel ; and it must have been performed in his name, whether expressed as a form of words to be used on baptismal occasions or not. In whose name should remission of sins be preached, if not in the name of him who saves his people from their sins ? To my mind, Paul nōt only states the fact, that John told the people to whom he preached the baptism of repentance, that they should believe on Jesus, but also, that the people hearing, were baptized in the name of Jesus. The study of this subject has convinced me that these words are the concluding words of what Paul said relative to John's ministry, and not, as I formerly thought, the words of the historian. I am driven to this by the facts stated by the evangelists ; for they say that John told the people to believe on Jesus. The account in the nineteenth chapter of Acts shows that the only thing done by Paul after repeating, in a very summary way, what he deemed necessary as preliminary to bestowing the gift of the Spirit, he laid his hands on these disciples, and the Holy Spirit came on them ; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied. Nothing is said, in the whole account, about their having been baptized *again*. From all the facts in the case it appears that "the baptism of repentance for remission of sins"—"the beginning of the good news of Jesus Christ, God's Son,"—was not discarded by Paul ; and that it is true that Apollos preached "the things *correctly* concerning Jesus, knowing only the baptism of John."

The baptism of repentance for remission of sins, then, having been shown to be the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it follows, that when Jesus preached the Gospel he must have preached the baptism of repentance for remission of sins. This accounts not only for the great number who came to John's baptism, but also for the greater number who were rebaptized by Jesus, through the agency of his disciples. For "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." (John iv, 1, 2.)

When Jesus commanded his apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature, he said : "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved ;" without intimating that any other baptism than the baptism of repentance for remission of sins was intended. The same remark is applicable to the case in Matthew, when he required the apostles

to baptize those disciplined in all the nations. The apostles all understood him that the baptism of repentance was the baptism enjoined for remission of sins; therefore, when they began in Jerusalem to teach all the nations, their reply to the earnest and important inquiry of many as to what they should do, in view of the truth spoken by Peter, was, "Repent and be each of you baptized on the name of Jesus Christ *for remission of sins.*" (Acts ii, 38.) When Jesus told the apostles that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all the nations, beginning in Jerusalem," they understood him that they were to preach "the baptism of repentance for remission of sins," as is proved by what they preached.

The views entertained by "the Christian Denominations" (?) have "perverted" the Gospel. I know of no people but those calling themselves "Disciples of Christ" and "Christians" who do not ignore the Gospel of Jesus Christ as preached by John, Jesus, and the apostles. "The Denominations" hold protracted meetings for days and weeks, and obtain many converts to their Churches, and never, in the whole course of their meetings, do they preach "the baptism of repentance for remission of sins;" nor will they permit any other persons to preach the Gospel in their meetings. Neither John, Jesus, nor the apostles, were they here, and unknown, would be permitted to preach as they did when in the world, to the crowds who now frequently attend protracted meetings.

The effect of John's preaching was that "all the country of Judea, and all they of Jerusalem" went out to him, and *were baptized by him in the Jordan River, confessing their sins.*" This was the result of John's protracted meeting. (Mark i, 5.)

"After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea, *and there* he remained with them, and baptized." (John iii, 22.) The effect of his protracted meeting was, "*that Jesus made and baptized more disciples* than John did, though Jesus himself did not baptize, but his disciples." (John iv, 1, 2.)

The apostles held a meeting in Jerusalem ten days after the ascension of Jesus, and by his order, and those who received the word "*were baptized; and on that day there were added about three thousand souls.*" (Acts ii, 41.)

Philip, a man full of Holy Spirit, "went down to the city of Samaria, and preached the Christ to them. And the multitudes with one

accord gave heed to the things said by Philip, when they heard and saw the signs which he wrought." And "when they believed Philip publishing the good news concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, *they were baptized, both men and women.*" These converts were so numerous that the word multitude would fail to convey an adequate idea of their number; and the historian was obliged to use the plural form, "the multitudes." (Acts viii, 6, 12.)

Paul held a meeting in the famed city of Corinth; "and Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord, with all his family; *and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized.*" (Acts xviii, 8.)

If the entire ministry of all "the denominations" would become evangelical, and preach according to the New Testament, a greater revolution would be produced in a year than has been effected in centuries past, and infidelity would cower before it. It would be a moral force which could not be resisted. The reasoning of scientists upon matter, and the evolution of men from the inferior animals, would find a force in the moral and spiritual constitution of human nature too strong for their motiveless theories, and which would more than refute their inferences relative to the origin of the human species. The constitution of human nature calls for something more than the supposition that, in some remote age, *apes shook off their tails, shed their coats, rounded up their faces*, and became men and women; and then, in process of time, forgot their origin, and supposed that there must have been a God to create them.

This paper has been written without any attempt at embellishment, hoping that the interesting facts, and the argument upon them, will be better appreciated by those for whom they have been presented in the plain style of evidence and sober argumentation.

The author claims to be a friend, and even more than a friend, to all who love our Lord Jesus Christ; and nothing would so much delight his heart as to see the Gospel of Christ restored to men, in a living ministry, and "the denominations" superseded by the "one body and one spirit" of the primitive days of the Church of Christ.

IV.—RECOVERY FROM SIN.

HOW can the sinner get back to God? The answer to this question involves all the fundamentals of theology; and it has been given differently in different ages and by different Churches, according as these fundamentals have been understood differently. This diversity has doubtless been of unfortunate, though it may not have been of fatal, tendency. Man may be approximately correct subjectively, while not understandingly right objectively. God regards the affections of the heart rather than the logic of the head. Nevertheless, it is very important that the head be as correct as practicable; for the heart can not be *absolutely* right so long as the head is fundamentally wrong on any fundamental point. The understanding is the medium through which God reaches the heart. If the medium is discolored or tortuous, God reaches the heart under a disfigured and distorted form. Any attempt at clearing up our understanding on this subject will, therefore, be a laudable endeavor; for evidently any view, even an erroneous one, is better than no view at all—any form of life being better than death.

The fundamentals involved in a sinner's coming back to God are: The *sinner* and *sin*, *God* and *redemption*, *God's law* and *holiness*. In speaking on these points here we can not, of course, pretend to exhaustiveness; nor can we even treat of them strictly consecutively; but we hope at least to make our thoughts consecutive. We, therefore, ask the candid reader candidly to hear us through before gathering together his heap of fagots.

To begin: What is *sin* and the *sinner*? The sinner is a moral agent, originally created in the image of God, and intended to retain and develop that image,—that is, to live in harmony with God—but who has voluntarily turned away from that intention, and thus thrown his life into hostility to God, and into disharmony with its true nature or constitutive idea. Sin is this hostility and disharmony; in a single word, it is "enmity" against God. And it is this enmity, not as a mere hostile *action* of the soul or heart; but also as a sin-generated *state* in the soul or heart. Sin is accordingly

the God-hating heart-action and heart-state of him who revolts against God. It has two distinct elements: it is action, and also state resultant upon action. As action, it is the soul's throwing itself out of harmony with God's creative will or intention. As state, it is the disharmony thereby impressed upon the soul or character or second nature. Further than this, in the analysis of sin, we can not go. The soul is at first a free, rational, vital essence, germinally endowed for life-communion with God. Its voluntary acceptance of this its destination would result in confirming its merely germinal or latent holiness into the positive holiness of character. Its right action would thus result in imbedding the soul in a confirmed habitude of right-acting, in positing within itself a God-harmonious second nature; that is, in impressing upon its essence a determinatedness toward communion with God. The soul, thus beginning and continuing to live, would actually realize God's purpose in making it; that is, it would raise its germinality into actuality. In other words, its reality would fill out the measure of its idea. The full notion of such a soul is that of a being who absolutely loves God and all that is God-like, and whose active life is the absolute expression of this love.

Now the sinner, in so far as sinner, is the absolute opposite of this. He is one who, in so far as sinner, absolutely hates God, and whose life, in so far, is the simple expression of that hatred. And his life is not merely hatred as affectional action, but also hatred as a heart-state; that is, as character or second nature. The saint is one who realizes the divine intention; the sinner is one who defeats it. They both start as germinal images of God; but while the saint is engaged in developing that image into full reality, the sinner is engaged in eliminating from himself even its germ. Thus, while the one is on the path to certain perfection and fruition, the other is sinking toward certain ruin and desolation. And that, too, not as something to be outwardly donated or inflicted at the end of the path, but as something immanently resultant upon the very nature of the two opposite forms of life. The saint is *realizing* himself, the sinner is *ruining* himself. When the saint has perfectly realized himself, he will be perfect, and hence happy. When the sinner has perfectly ruined himself, he will be ruined, and hence unhappy. The process in both cases is progressive. The saint progresses in devel-

oping the germinal image of God until his whole being has become confirmed into active, permanent harmony with God ; that is, into absolute holiness of character. The sinner progresses in violating this image until his whole being becomes confirmed into a state of permanent enmity to God ; that is, into absolute sinfulness of character. As the process in both cases is a moral, and hence voluntary, one, it may be arrested and reversed at any point this side of the final goal ; for, until the goal is fully reached, there still remains more or less susceptibility of the contrary course of development. *This side of this goal there lies, therefore, for the saint, the possibility of yet falling back into sin, and for the sinner, that of turning back to God.*

Depravity is sin, as having become the natural proclivity or confirmed habitude of humanity as an organic whole. In fallen humanity every child is not only born into the midst of a net-work of temptations to sin, but also into a psychical organism, which is weighed down with the disadvantage of an inherited habitude of sin. This inherited depravedness is, therefore, at first strictly objective to the essence of the new-born soul ; but it is of such fatal potency over the germinal soul that is born into it, that this soul quite uniformly yields to its attraction, and thus appropriates its objectively inherited sinfulness as its own personal sinful character ; so that thenceforth the sinner is to be regarded as a simple individual, sustaining a wrong relation to God in the two respects of being actively hostile to God, and of bearing within himself this hostility as a state of confirmed habitude.

We are now ready to inquire : What is the remedy for this sinful action and state of the soul ? How is the sinner to be brought back to God ?

The remedy is suggested by the very nature of the disease. The disease is enmity to God ; the remedy is, therefore, that this enmity cease. But as the life of the soul can not be a mere negative, but must be positive ; hence the *full* remedy for sin is not merely that the enmity cease, but also that the opposite quality of love take its place. Enmity to God is the disease of the sinner ; love to God will be his cure.

Is not this the case, and the whole of the case ? Is not the sinner's ailment simply a life of hostility to God, together with the

baneful, sinward proclivity generated in the soul by that hostility; that is, is it not simply sin and the fruits of sin? And is not the sole need of the sinner simply that he get rid of this hostility and of the havoc thereby inwrought into his soul? and that love and the fruits of love be implanted in his soul instead? If such is not the whole of his ailment, and the whole of his need, we shall be thankful for an enumeration of the features omitted.

Assuming that in this we are correct, the problem of redemption takes on this form: How are enmity to God, and the fruits of that enmity to be eradicated from the soul? and love to God, and the fruits of this love, to be brought about in their stead? The true answer can be given only in the light of psychological law.

What, then, is hatred, enmity? What is love? Hatred is a disapproving, antagonizing action of the soul toward some moral being, and the soul-state therefrom resulting. Love is an approving, seconding, harmonizing action of the soul, together with the state thereupon resultant. In both cases they are an action and a state of the soul; and, in fact, they differ simply in being the precise converse of each other. The true causal origin of these actions and states is within, in the free volition of the soul itself. True, there is an occasioning cause without, in the attraction or repulsion of the object of the love or hatred. The responsible cause, however,—that without which the hatred or love would never exist—is the free action of the will as yielding to the attraction or repulsion.

How, now, can such an action and state as love or hatred be arrested, eradicated, and reversed in the soul? How can the sinner be recovered to God? Sinfulness being enmity against God, and enmity being a volitional action of the soul, it is evident that sinfulness can be arrested only by a reversal of the volitional action of the sinner. How can the voluntary action of a free agent be arrested? Evidently not by direct external power; and hence, not directly by the Spirit of God. The external effect of the volitions of one being may be repressed by another will; but not the volitions themselves. Hence, sinfulness can not be taken out of a sinner by direct divine power. As a state resultant upon voluntary action, it can be removed only by the reversal of that action. And as any voluntary action can be reversed only by its own free subject, it is self-evident that the sinner's sinful action and state can be reversed only by the free

will of the sinner himself. And as the holy action and holy state of a moral subject is simply the reverse of the sinful action and sinful state of a sinful subject, it follows that we are correct in saying that a sinner can become a saint only through his own free volition. We do not mean by this that he can do this without help; but we mean that this help can not be *causal*; it can not be dynamic, but only solicitive or attractional. The magnet *causes* the steel to reverse itself. Temptation *solicits* the moral subject to sin. Eloquence *persuades* to heroism, but it does not cause it. So the influences which help a sinner into a saint are only *influences*, but not *causes*. They attract, solicit, persuade, but do not cause. This is so from the very definitions of the case. For sin is volition and the result of volition. Now, volition is the action of a subject; as such it can be arrested only by its own subject. It is the will which sins; it is only that same will which can cease to sin. The sinner, in becoming a saint, does not lose his identity. The will, which now loves God, is the same will which once hated God. The same will was the author of both forms of action; and this same will was the cause of its own change of action.

But is this change of action in the volitional power of the soul the sole causal factor in the sinner's becoming a saint? Yes: this change, together with its *implications*. For the moral nature of man is not any one faculty or class of faculties, but the whole organism of man. Man is not moral merely in his conscience or in his heart; but in his whole being. Now, as the will is that central function in man which determines and tones all his other functions, hence a change in his will works a change in the action of his whole being. Perverse volition plunged primitive man into the impotency of depravity. Perverse volition, in actual man, appropriates this depravity, and adds to it the force of personal habituation. The only remedy for this is that this perverse volitionating reverse itself, and continue reversed until the depraved second nature be eliminated, and a holy second nature deposited or generated in its place.

The remedy for the sinful action and state of the soul is, therefore, not some medication from without; not some new essence incorporated into the soul; not some dynamic infringement made upon the substance of the soul; but simply a reversal of the action of the soul itself. How, now, is this reversal to be brought about? By *help*, we

have observed above ; but by solicitive, not causal help. If the help were causal, then the action thereby caused would be due to this cause ; and hence, not attributable to the subject at all. It would be the pure effect of the cause ; and hence, have no more relation to the subject than to the rings of Saturn. Any change in the sinner that is of any moral value must spring *causally* from the will of that sinner himself. The help that the sinner needs is therefore of the nature of influence upon the will. *All* such influence is expressible under the word *motive*. To this we are forced by the very nature of the case. The remedy needed is volition-change ; and volition is influence only by motive, a forced volition being no volition at all.

What, now, are the motives that solicit the sinner back to God ? They are in part *natural* and in part *miraculous*. Human nature being constructed for loyal harmony with God, it necessarily sinks toward ruin in proportion as it goes away from God. This threatening ruin is of the nature of a strong motive to cease the life which bears such fruits. But the goads of misery are not enough. They center in self, and appeal to self. God visits the soul also in special revelations—through visions, through prophets, through his Word. These visitations “awaken” the soul to a consciousness of its true condition ; that is, to the fact that it was made *for* God, that it has foolishly gone away *from* its true end, and that its only remedy is to turn *back* to God. All the helpful motives that can possibly come to bear upon the sinner are such as contribute to deepen, brighten, and intensify this consciousness of what he *is* and what he *ought* to be. It was to intensify this consciousness that God gave his law on Sinai, and prescribed his symbolical ritual worship, and warned through the prophets, and took upon himself the form of sinful flesh, and finally gave his Spirit as a perennial inner revelation to humanity everywhere. What is the essential feature of all these motives ? It is their tendency to impress upon the sinner the facts that his misery is remediable ; that it is but the inevitable fruits of a mistaken life ; and that God infinitely desires that he escape from his misery and come back to fruition. *The effect of those motives upon the sinner's will is to furnish a counterpoise to his depravity and to his personally generated character of sin ; so that his will is again raised into free equilibrium between God and sin, and is thus enabled freely to elect God as the center of its outgoings.* This is as far as the motives, the help, could

go. If they went so far as to bear the affections away by storm, as the sweeping tide bears down the sea-weed, the morality of the process would be entirely lost. As well praise the steel for clinging to the magnet, as the soul for clinging to God under such circumstances. They go simply far enough to enable the soul to take hold of God, notwithstanding that it is imbedded in a substratum of sinfulness; that is, of depravity backed by sinful personal character. Thus viewed, these motives restore to man his forfeited moral freedom, and place the decision of his own destiny again in his own hands. Man is now able, by grace, fully to keep God's law; that is, to love God and the good with his whole heart; in other words, to fulfill the true end of his being; and hence, to become supremely blissful in absolute harmony with God. And the speediness with which he makes his transition from the misery and slavery of sin to the bliss and freedom of absolute holiness is in precise ratio to the entirety and persistency with which his heart lays hold upon God; that is, it is in exact proportion to the strength of his *faith*. But the blissful communion with God may be, and remain, perfect from the very moment when the affections, letting go their grasp on the world, sweep about and lay hold on God. *All that is yet lacking in order to absolute holiness is, that the faith-life of love to God continue long enough to break down and eradicate the old character of sinful habitude, and generate in its stead a new character of holy habitude.* If the sinful character had gone on developing until it had reached completion, then the sinner would have become *unredeemable*; for the last lineament of his true nature as an image of God, would have been eradicated. So, when the holy character reaches its goal of development, the saint will have become impeccable and *indefectible*; for the germinal image of God with which he was at first gifted will have become the absolute quality of his whole being.

Such, it seems to us, is an adequate statement of the conditions of a sinner's recovery to God; such are the requirements of psychology, and such the spirit of Christianity.

But here, we imagine we have some doubting, objecting, and exclaiming, Can this be so? Is it possible that salvation is so simple? What then becomes of some of the complex theories of modern theology? What of the atonement? What of the broken law of God? What of divine justice? What of the penal sanction of the law?

What of God's wrath? What of an intercessor between God and man? What of the sacrifice on Calvary?

To this doubter we beg to say a few words of Christian soberness and honesty. If he will closely follow us, he will find, we think, that our view ignores none of these factors which he thinks in jeopardy, but in fact calls for them all, and differs from the traditional view only by a difference of interpretation. Let us see.

Our view of the ailment of the sinner, that it consists in a perversion of his heart-life, and of the havoc (inherited and personal) thereby wrought on his being, will not be objected to. But it may be thought that this depravedness is so deep that the reversal of the action of the soul can not possibly countermark it. Must there not be the direct application of objective power? Must not God's Spirit strike off the shackles of sin, as the lightning rives the rock? Such a conception is materialistic: it views sin as an objective substance. But sin is not such entity; it is character; and we might as well think of making a man honest by electrical shocks, as of removing a bad character by direct external power of any kind.

So also of holiness. *Holiness is not an objective something that can be injected into the soul.* Such a view is frightful; it can only be entertained in the utter absence of reflection. But it is the inmost character of the soul itself. It is not *created*, but *generated*. It is not given to the soul, but springs up *within* it. It is the deposit of a God-harmonious character consequent upon a God-harmonious soul-life. As well conceive of God as objectively giving us a well-stored memory as of his so conferring upon us holiness. Capability of holiness is conferred upon us, but holiness itself is the product of *faith*; and *faith is our own personally volitionated cleaving to God.*

But our view, that the influence which God exerts upon the sinner is purely of the nature of *motive*, will be less readily accepted. But is not this view correct? If man is *not* a free being, then his life-course may be reversed by direct power. But, if he *is* free, then is he to be influenced only by that which is consistent with freedom. Now, how is intelligent freedom to be influenced? Not by force, but only through ideas; that is, through truth. God makes the sinner conscious of the truth of his condition—the danger and misery before him, the way to escape it, and his infinite forgivingness and compassion for him. All these means of awakening and converting the sinner

are of the nature of motives placed before his freedom. None of them are of the nature of directly applied dynamic force. The sinner is recovered to God by influences which appeal to his freedom. Any other recovery would be no recovery; *the will can be reversed only by the will itself, in view of motives.*

Now, is not this the spirit of the Bible? is not providence, is not the incarnation, is not the teaching of Christ, is not Calvary, is not the preached Gospel, purely of the nature of motives appealing to man's freedom? So it seems to us. The primitive concessions and prohibition in Eden, were they not of the nature of appeals to man's freedom, holding up before him the advantages of obedience and the danger of revolt? The sentence upon fallen man, and the promises to him, what were they but endeavors to *persuade* him to retrace his steps? And the tender protection and providence of God over the patriarchs and over the chosen nation, were they not an effort to keep alive in humanity some consciousness of its true destination, and to train up a portion of the race into ability to receive fuller revelations and to be the communicators thereof to other nations? The thunders of Sinai, the threatenings of the prophets, the giving of the Jews into captivity, were not they all intended to convince the chosen but thankless nation, that its true good was found only in cleaving to God with undivided heart? The sending of the second Adam, was it not an endeavor of the same kind? Was it not because God so loved the world, so desired that we should come back from ruin, that he sent his Son into our flesh? Was not the whole earthly career of Jesus one great endeavor to convince us of our lost estate, and to persuade us back to our Father's house? Was he not a light sent into our darkness that we might see and feel the truth? Was he not an infinitely clear revelation of God's readiness and desire to forgive us so soon as we are sick of sin and desirous of being forgiven? And what was the evident chief significance of the agonies of Gethsemane and of the spectacle of Calvary? Was it not the infinite sorrow of Christ at the thanklessness and blind perverseness of the people? Was it not his infinite grief that they would not heed his warnings, and would not yield to his love? Did he not love us even unto death? Did he not, out of love to us, suffer his life to be violently taken from him? In a word, have not all of God's dealings toward us been of the nature of direct or indirect appeals to

our better nature, to our true reason? That is, have they not consisted in *motives* presented to our freedom?

But it may be objected, Does not such a construction of the significance of Christ ignore the chief features of that significance. Did not Christ come in order to *atone* for sin, to *satisfy* the claims of divine justice, and to *reconcile* God to man?

To this we answer yes or no, according to the construction that is put upon terms. And the only safe criteria for making the true construction are the spirit of Scripture and the necessities of the case; and the sole competent court for making this construction is the individual conscience, as enlightened by all the helps at its command. It is not, therefore, to traditional theology or to Church creeds that we are to make appeal; but solely and simply to Scripture and to reason.

How now does the case stand with Scripture? We frankly admit that, in the Oriental figurativeness of the Bible, texts may be cited which seem to teach that God was wrathful against the world; that Christ intervened between the incensed God and offending man; that God visited upon the innocent Christ in Gethsemane and on the cross, the punishment due to the guilty sinner; and that only, on the ground of this full satisfaction made to the claims of justice, is he enabled to pass over the guilt of the sinner and admit him back into divine favor. But is the literal construction of such texts the right construction? Is God such a God as such a construction would imply? Does not the collective spirit of Scripture represent God as a forgiving God, ready to receive the sinner on the sinner's desiring to return? Now, then, shall we not look suspiciously upon an interpretation of his Word, which deprives forgiveness of the very essence of forgiveness? Is not Christ first and chiefly a revelation of God's love to man? How, then, can we consent that his chief service to us be made to consist in his removing a technical difficulty or obstacle to the outflowing of God's love?

We can not do this; and for the following reasons: In the first place, God was not wrathful against the sinner. Scripture expressions which imply this must be taken as anthropomorphic. God is perfect, and perfection precludes wrath. God made man that he might be blissful in God-likeness. When man defeated his own end, the infinitely perfect One could have toward him only the feelings that a wise father could have toward an erring child. As

the good shepherd or the father of the prodigal, he could only seek after the lost one, and yearn till he found him and won him back. Moreover, what rational end could divine wrath serve? It could not render God happy; and it could not benefit the sinner; for, if it could, it would no longer be wrath, but only love. No; God as infinitely perfect, could only regret that the sinner was ruining himself, and could only lovingly endeavor to woo him back to his true end. This being the case, there is no obstacle to the sinner's return to God but his own perverse will of enmity. Pour upon him such light and evidence of love as to call him "to himself," and his will will be likely to lay hold upon the inviting God; and then the work of his recovery to God is already solved—he *is* recovered.

But what becomes here of the claims of divine justice? We answer: They are not met, and, in the nature of the case, never can be met. The sinner has sinned; that is a fact, and it will remain a fact to all eternity. The sinner is guilty of having sinned; that is a fact, and a fact it will remain forever. The only possible help in the nature of the case is, that his guilt be *forgiven*; that is, that the claims of justice be, in so far, relaxed and foregone. This is the very idea of forgiveness; for a forgiveness that is only conceded after the claims of violated justice have been met, is not forgiveness at all, but simple justice. But both Scripture and reason represent God's receiving back the sinner as an act of gracious forgiveness.

But what is the true idea of divine justice? what is the real nature of the divine law? Does not a good deal of the confusion in which these ideas involve us arise from our anthropomorphically imputing the lame procedures of human relations and policy directly to the Divine Being? The simple idea of justice is, that a free being render to others that which it owes to them. In the case of man and God, it is that both parties be true to their mutual relations. Man being under the relation of absolute obligation to God, he is just when he loves God with his whole heart. God, as the giver of all, desires and expects that man respond to this state of things. *God's law is the understood or expressed or written formulation of the relations existing between him and his creatures.* As such, it is the guide which shows souls the way to God. It is promissory, as portraying the advantages of being true to our true destination. It is menacing, as pointing out to us the ruin inevitably consequent

upon our being false to our true destination. The absolute law of God would be the perfect expression of the whole truth of the universe. The absolute moral law of God would be a formula which absolutely and exhaustively expressed all the inter-relations between God and all moral creatures, together with the results consequent upon the fulfillment or violation of those relations. The moral law in relation to man is expressed to us under *various more or less perfect forms*, such as the suggestions of nature, the promptings of the conscience, the promises to the patriarchs, the statutes of Moses, the symbolism of the Jewish ritual, the imagery of the prophets, the example and utterances of Christ, and the collective canonical Scriptures as constructed into self-consistency by centuries of Christian thought. The total purport of this law is, that it shows us how we can, and how we can not, be and become what God intended us to be and become when he created us. Duty, right, obligation, justice, are words relating to our responding to this intention. Sin, guilt, express our failure to so respond. Now, when we sin, the simple fact is, that, in so far, we so fail. This failure becomes thus a fact in our history. Now, in the very nature of things, this fact can never be undone; can never become other than a fact; can not be blotted out. No supposed punishment inflicted *ab extra* upon the offender can change the facts in the case. The claims of law have been violated, and no punishment can cause that they shall have not been violated. The only conceivable remedy in the case is, as we have already remarked, that the sinner's sins be forgiven, and that he turn back to God and sin no more.

But is there, then, no penalty inflicted upon the sinner? Is sin not punished? Yes, or no, according as we understand punishment. Direct punishment inflicted *ab extra* upon the sinner in view of making good the claims of the violated law, there is none. For the claims of the law are that the law shall never have been violated; but it has been violated, and no punishment, nor any thing else, can alter the facts in the case. Punishment is not so loosely connected with sin as the notion of an *ab extra* infliction would imply; but it is the direct fruit or wages of sin. Its truest conception is that of *an effect immanent in sin as a cause*. He who sins *must* suffer; for to sin is to cast one's self athwart the path of the wheels of universal order. There is nothing arbitrary in punishment; it is

inevitably involved in the nature of sin. It is a moral necessity. As such, it is beyond the power of God to prevent. True, there is, in the present drama of fallen humanity, such a thing as special inflictions of punishment; but these are not so much punishments proper as rather the mere chastisements of paternal love in view of the good of the chastised. Hence, they are simply disguised love. So, also, of the inflictions visited, for example, upon Sodom and Gomorrah. These were inflicted, not out of direct wrath at the wicked cities, but out of love to humanity as a whole. They were miracles of mercy, intended to prevent those visited by them from working deeper havoc on themselves and on the race. But these inflictions fall out of the category of punishment proper, being of exceptional and miraculous character. Strict punishment is of immanent character, and is not a direct infliction; but, on the contrary, a direct effect. In this sense all sin is punished—punished by the havoc it works upon our moral nature—punished forever, *unless* disavowed by the repentant sinner, and forgiven by the gracious God.

But on what condition is the sinner forgiven? On condition that he cease to hate God and begin to love him; that is, on condition that he disavow his present state of sin, accept the forgiveness offered to him in Christ, and lay hold upon God and all good with his whole heart. This forgiveness is an act of pure mercifulness or grace.

But what is to be done with the dignity of God's law? Has the law not been dishonored? Has not the majesty of heaven been insulted? Yes; a thousand times, yes. All this has been shamefully done; and is still done by every sinner so long as he remains a sinner. But then, what is to be done? What remedy is there? There is none—absolutely none. This dishonoring of God and his law is simply a fact, and that fact can never be blotted out. There is no remedy for the past; the only possible remedy is in regard to the future, and consists in the sinner's ceasing to dishonor God by repenting of his past and turning to God. Moreover, the phrases "honor of the law," "insulted majesty," etc., play a much larger rôle in dogmatic theology than in the Word of God. They belong to the code of chivalry rather than to the Gospel of Christ. God is not to be brought into the category of a Quixotic knight, desperately intent upon preserving unsullied the phantom of an artificial honor. God is not man; especially such a man.

But if sin is directly forgiven ; if the claims of justice are not met ; if the punishment threatened by the law is not strictly executed ; if, at least, some innocent victim is not substituted in place of the guilty one, and punished in his stead, how can God any longer make his government of the universe respected, how can he be assured that his creatures, *emboldened by impunity, will not raise the standard of revolt* throughout his vast domains, and thus precipitate the universe back into chaos and ancient night ? If penalty is not inflicted for guilt, will not the reins of government fall out of God's hands ? This is the most plausible question that can be urged against the view of salvation here presented. It is based on a conception that has shaped orthodox theology ever since the days of Anselm ; and yet this construction is simply a *misconception*. It consists in anthropomorphically conceiving of the divine government strictly after the pattern of a mere human government, and then of literally attributing to the former every thing that holds good of the latter. Thus, a *human* governor would cease to be obeyed if he did not strictly visit guilt with condign punishment : therefore, the *Divine* Governor would do so likewise. Than this, what could be a more complete begging of the question ? And yet precisely upon this sophism have rested the various forensic, legalistic, mercantile, substitutionary constructions of the atonement which have so long and so largely discolored the general drift of orthodox dogmatics ! The analogy between human and divine government does not hold good at all. The two governments rest upon contradictory principles. Human government rests upon fear ; divine government rests upon love. Human government rests upon force ; divine government rests upon affection. Human government is formal and outward ; divine government is inward and spiritual. Instead, therefore, of being analogous, they are almost antipodal. Perfect allegiance to a human government may rest upon absolute fear ; but allegiance to the divine government is perfect only when fear is absolutely "cast out." Hence the inference, that unless God punished sin, and thus made himself feared, the foundations of his government would crumble beneath him, is absolutely without basis. God is obeyed from no such consideration. The bond which binds to God the moral universe is not fear ; but, on the contrary, perfect love, which casteth out fear. There is, therefore, no ground for the bugbear of a

governmental necessity upon God of visiting punishment upon some head, even an innocent one, in order to the forgiveness of the repenting prodigal. The sinner is forgiven out of pure grace; and saints and angels and archangels instead of therefore turning their backs upon the gracious Forgiver, only love him with the more infinite love.

Such is the only conception that we are able to form of the process of salvation through Christ. We do not presume that it is fully correct; in fact, no human construction of so momentous a system can be more than approximately perfect. But we believe that it points in the direction of the ultimate truth. We cheerfully admit that it has against it the literal reading of a few isolated texts and a considerable amount of Pauline analogy; but we believe that these texts and analogies are to be taken anthropomorphically, and that the view we have presented does less violence to the collective spirit of Scripture, than the view which takes them literally.

V.—THE UNITY OF THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM.

ONE of the strangest anomalies in the religious world, at the present day, is the fact that while the various denominations, in conventions and through the press, are discussing vigorously the propriety and necessity of Christian Union on some common basis, they never appeal to the Word of God as the great solvent of sectarian tribulations. Whether this omission is an intended oversight, or whether the parties are stupidly ignorant of the plan of salvation, or whether they fear losing denominational identity by comparing their standards and creeds by the Word of God, are questions which we shall, for the present, not investigate. Accepting the Word of God, which all orthodox parties acknowledge to be authentic, divine, and authoritative, all their actions, nevertheless, go to show that, in order to the consummation so devoutly sought after, they suppose God will interpose a special moral miracle, and that, by a power transcending the spiritual power of revealed truth, precipitate the great event. In our conception, the moral miracle of the age would be

seen in all its resplendent glories, in all its concentrated power, in all its subduing effects, in all its purifying influence, the very moment all professing Christians would yield up all theological teaching but the Bible; abandon all leaders save the one Lord; read no book as an infallible guide but the Bible; follow no proclaimers of the Gospel except the apostles; bear no name but the Christian name; accept of that "one baptism" about which there can be no dispute; exercise the same discipline that characterized the primitive Church; make every congregation of disciples a little republic under Christ, without the domination of archbishops, prelates, conferences, councils, conventions, or synods. The unreserved and absolute acceptance of the Bible, and the utter rejection of every thing that is anti-Bible and antichristian, would produce a moral miracle that should astonish the world. We are of the opinion that this event is not very far distant. It begins to be conceded on all hands, even by the truest friends of Jesus, that Christianity never can triumph until all sectarian establishments are wholly demolished. Remove these impediments, and let only Christ be known and preached, and Christianity will move on with such accelerated power, and with such an increased momentum, that the stream of love which makes glad the city of our God would soon subdue all kingdoms and empires, and complete the prophecy which says: "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

Taking a general survey of the religious world, torn into a thousand fragments as it is, one unacquainted with the contents of the Bible would inevitably arrive at the conclusion that such a thing as a systematically developed order of Christianity, inside the sacred Oracles, is not to be found. We shall assume that Christianity is a divine unity, and at once set about to prove it by the Word of God; and that, too, on the principle that the proposition and the proof must be homogeneous. Christianity is a grand historical proposition, and must be established by historical evidence. The whole system is based upon the fact of the resurrection of Christ. Without the establishment of this fact, there remains nothing but a myth—nothing but a stupendous fabrication. As we are not writing for unbelievers, but only for the professed children of God, we shall not undertake to prove that which is accepted by all Christian people. This fact—the resurrection of Christ—is completely sustained by the apostle Paul, by an

elaborate argument in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. After receiving the great commission, being ratified on the day of Pentecost by the miraculous attestation of the Holy Spirit, wherever the apostles went, they sought, first of all, to prove, by testimony the most incontestable, that Christ had risen from the grave and ascended on high. Without proving this fact, their mission was a failure. They preached Christ and him crucified. They preached the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. As the ambassadors of Christ, and as being plenarily inspired, they spoke by his authority; declared the facts of the Gospel as they never were declared before; and, as ministers of the Word, were the first class of men who ever preached salvation in the name of Jesus the Christ. Hence, it is wholly unnecessary and unwarrantable to go beyond the preaching of the apostles to find the Gospel, except as we shall find it in prophecy and preparation. Whatever the apostles of the Lamb preached was binding on all coming generations. Christ himself lived and died under the law. Christianity was never established till after his death, resurrection, and ascension—not until the apostles were endowed with the Holy Spirit and “guided into all the truth.” The founder of Christianity said to his apostles, “Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” We date the beginning of Christ’s reign from the day of Pentecost. From that time forth the law of Christ becomes authoritative. The reign of Christ was adumbrated in the law of Moses. The Jewish dispensation was typical of the Christian dispensation. Abraham foresaw Christ’s day, and rejoiced. The prophets trumpeted in silver tones the rising glories of the golden age of Christianity. John the Baptist prepared a people for the coming of the Lord. The apostle Peter was the first to preach salvation in the name of him who was received into the heavens, and who was coronated both Lord and Christ. The unity of these facts is generally conceded by the religious world. The facts mentioned are admitted to be coherent and harmonious; so much so, that they allow no controversy.

The next great question which arises is this: *Were the apostles uniform in their preaching?* As already intimated, the very first thing the ambassadors of Christ sought to fix in the minds of the people, wherever they unfurled the banner of the cross, whether among the

Jews or the Greeks, was the absolute certainty of the resurrection of Jesus the Christ. The resurrection of Christ was an established fact. Did the apostles use precisely the same testimony in establishing this fact? Neither Protestant nor Catholic dare negative such a question. Even an attempt to deny that the apostles declared the same facts would prove fatal to the pretensions of the Christian religion. They used the same set of facts in producing faith in the minds of the Romans, the Galatians, the Corinthians, the Ephesians, the Colossians, or the Hebrews. It is nowhere recorded that the apostles ever preached an opinion. Though infallibly guided into all the truth by the Holy Spirit, it stands nowhere recorded that they ever preached the Holy Spirit. They advanced no theory; they expounded no theology; they adduced no philosophy. They invariably presented the divine person of Christ. Failing to make the person of Christ the superlative feature of all preaching, both Protestants and Catholics have met with but comparative success in converting the nations.

It is an established fact that the apostles, and evangelists co-operating with them, addressed themselves only to persons who were capable of believing and obeying. Only such as believed and were baptized into the name of Christ were received into, and constituted members of, the one body of Christ. In the absence of one particle of evidence to prove that infants were ever baptized and formally received into the Church, we pass the subject by as entirely unworthy of notice. The unity of the original faith has been most disastrously disarranged by the introduction of this Papal dogma; and, on account of which, the Protestant world must be held equally responsible with the Roman Catholic world. Every person converted to Christ in the apostolic era was addressed as a rational, intelligent, and responsible being. We learn from Acts of Apostles, as well as from the epistolary writings, that every "household" converted to Christ was a household of penitent "believers." If, therefore, Protestant denominations are sincerely seeking the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," why do they not at once discard the dogma of infant baptism—a dogma that has only for generations been sustained by the remotest inferences? When the divine testimonies, as presented by the apostles, convicted men of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment to come, and these men gave proof of their faith by solemnly propounding the question, "*What shall we do?*" the answer

was ever ready: "*Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.*" Was there ever any departure from this uniform method? Were the conditions of salvation always the same to all sinners, and did all sinners come to Christ by the same order—by faith, repentance, confession, and baptism? Did Paul contradict Peter by preaching a gospel in Rome which Peter never preached in Jerusalem? Were sinners told one thing in Corinth and another thing in Athens? Was not "the Gospel" as much "the power of God" in Ephesus as in Cæsarea? The apostle Peter, in writing "to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia (Minor), and Bithynia, addresses them all as having "obtained *the like precious faith*, . . . through the righteousness of God and our Savior Jesus Christ." If it was necessary for one man to be baptized, seeing that all men are under the condemnation of God, and since baptism was one of the constituent elements of the Gospel, is it not equally necessary that all men who hear the glad tidings of salvation should be baptized? Both sacred and profane history attest that, during the first three centuries of the Christian era, baptism was universally acknowledged to be the organic law of induction into the kingdom of God. It would, therefore, be illogical to conclude that because baptism was not always expressed in every case of conversion, that baptism is not necessary in every case where the Gospel is now preached. As God has "commanded all men every-where to repent," it follows as an actual necessity that all men must repent, although in some cases of conversion, as reported in the New Testament, the condition of repentance is not expressed in words. But who can preach the Gospel without preaching "repentance toward God?" If it was necessary in one case to "witness a good confession," and to "confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus Christ," and especially since the confession of that great and wonderful name incurred martyrdom, is it not just as necessary yet to confess,—"*I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?*" Though it was very seldom that the apostles commanded sinners to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ" in order to the remission of sins, because it was their invariable rule to present Christ in such a manner as to cause men to believe through the force of testimony, we, nevertheless, learn from supplemented passages of Scripture that "without faith it is impossible to please God." From the Scriptural premises already

laid down, we immediately arrive at the conclusion, that no one can be received into the Church of Christ without faith in the Messiah as prophet, priest, and king ; without repentance toward God ; without publicly acknowledging Jesus as the Son of God ; and without being baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. And, moreover, that no one has the promise of the Holy Spirit as an abiding comforter who does not perfect his faith through "obedience" to the Gospel. As the Roman soldier took upon himself the *sacramentum* when enlisting in the service of the government, so the Christian soldier took upon himself the *sacramentum* when he invoked the names of the Trinity in the ordinance of baptism. After taking this sacred oath, the convert began his Christian career.

By these facts we can readily discover how "the unity of the Holy Spirit" has been marred and disturbed by the substitution of infant baptism (than which nothing has so corrupted the Church in all ages), the mourning-bench system, dreams, ecstasies, phantasms, false visions, and mesmeric impulses. As in the apostolic era, no one was ever converted to Christ except by the power of the truth through the Gospel, so we declare that the denominations of the day can never come together in the unity of the Spirit until all these substitutes in the divine arrangement are forever abandoned. All the elements of the Gospel are simple units. There is nothing complex or compound in the plan of salvation. This being so, there is no possible excuse for the existence of sectarianism. We find no *systems* of faith as emanating from apostolic teaching ; no different *modes* of baptism ; no *powers* of the Gospel ; no multiplied approaches to Christ ; no *laws* of faith ; no *laws* of the Spirit. As representing the Christian system, we read in the New Testament of "*the Gospel* as the power of God," "*the law* of faith," "*the law* of the Spirit," "*the word* of reconciliation," "*the ministry* of reconciliation," "*the apostle's doctrine*," "*that form* of doctrine," etc. We nowhere read of the *doctrines* of Christ, the *doctrines* of the apostles, or of the *Gospels* of salvation. The word doctrine (Greek, διδασκαλία) means teaching ; and, in the New Testament sense, always refers to "the unity of the Spirit," as set forth by Christ and his apostles. Hence, he who follows the apostles implicitly can never go wrong. The Gospel, as developed by the apostles, was but the amplification and

perfection in detail of that which the great Teacher enunciated in general principles. But let us take a few examples of the use of this word doctrine. It is recorded that when Jesus finished his Sermon on the Mount, "the people were astonished at his *doctrine*." In the primitive Church the disciples of Christ "continued steadfastly in the apostle's *doctrine*," which consisted of facts and precepts and promises; and in these respects was very unlike the speculative doctrines of the present day; very different in character from the theological dogmas of modern denominationalism. Paul, in the sixth chapter of Romans, when referring to the ordinance of baptism, says: "God be thanked, that though you were the servants of sin, you have obeyed from the heart that form of *doctrine* which was delivered to you." When addressing Timothy he writes: "Take heed to thyself and to the *doctrine*"—a system of teaching consistent and harmonious with itself, and which he was instructed to "commit to faithful men," that they might "teach others" the same divine plan of salvation. After enumerating sundry evils that were perplexing the faithful, he adds these words: "And if there be any other thing that is contrary to *sound doctrine*." To Titus he says: "But speak thou the things that become *sound doctrine*," or that mode of teaching which led to Gospel obedience and a holy life.

It is not by the doctrine or teaching of Christ and his apostles that mankind are perplexed and confounded, but by "*the doctrines*" of men and demons. When Jesus was inculcating his truth in the presence of the Pharisees, he rebuked them severely, and exposed their false practices, by saying: "In vain do you worship me, teaching for *doctrines* the precepts of men." We read of "the doctrines of demons" (1 Tim. iv, 1), and of "doctrines of men" (Col. ii, 22); but in contrast with these, we read of "*the doctrine of God*" (Titus ii, 10), "*the doctrine which is according to godliness*" (1 Tim. vi, 1), and of "*sound doctrine*." (Titus i, 9.) This teaching is a divine unity, of which Christ is the living head, and from whom we derive all light and knowledge. The sporadic spread of spiritualism throughout America and in many parts of Europe, succeeded by general demoralization, the loosening of the tenderest ties of nature, the boastful denial of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, gross irreverence for the Word of God, and treating the Bible as of less consequence than any human composition, shows, to the satisfaction of every candid mind,

what "the doctrines of demons" have done. These spiritualists are as much divided in their opinions as respects the phenomena of their system as are Protestants in regard to their theological speculations—the diverse opinions of Protestants on "untaught questions," which are continually engendering strife, and the false philosophies of Pantheistic spiritualists, which please only to bewilder and damn the devotees of the dangerous doctrines—whose servants bear poison in a golden chalice—whose priestesses lull the senses of men to sleep. Such nonsensical metaphysics as Protestants teach, such sensuous sermons as Spiritualists deliver, and such superstitious folly as Romanists inculcate—turning mankind from "the truth unto fables"—all these tell us why Christ is betrayed in his own house, mocked by his own friends, and why his doctrine is put to an open shame. Instead of confining themselves to the facts of a divine revelation, and instead of striving for the unity of the one faith, Protestants have been beguiling the world with the deductions of their own reason; and instead of inculcating the plain precepts of Paul and Peter, and insisting on fealty to Jesus Christ, the Lord of all, they have spent three centuries in fighting Romanism, explaining the "Institutes" of Calvin, reconciling Luther with himself, showing that the Five Points of Armenianism are superior to the Five Points of Calvinism, and that the "polity of *our* Church" is much more excellent than "the polity of *your* Church." Hence, Christianity stands as a speechless statue in a Babel of confusion.

In face of the plainest teaching of Christ and his apostles, and enjoying the privilege of contemplating a system of salvation a child may understand, the so-called great lights of "evangelical Christianity"—as if there were in existence a Christianity that is not evangelical—have assumed the ungracious responsibility of apologizing for the presence of so many denominations; and that, too, in opposition to the repeated declarations of the Great Teacher and his apostles. Christ forcibly sets forth the unity of his doctrine when he declares: "*I am the Vine: you are the branches;*" that is, regenerated men and women constitute the branches of the Vine, and not distinctive denominations. There is but one fold, as there is but one Shepherd. "I am the good Shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father. And other sheep I have which are not of this fold:

them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be *one fold and one Shepherd.*" While in the times of the apostles "the middle wall of partition was broken down between Jews and Gentiles," and "all were made one in Christ Jesus," in these last days so many walls of partition have been erected, and so many distinct chambers have been architecturally laid out, ornamented with bristling bastions, that it has become a moral impossibility for Protestants and Catholics to sing and pray and worship in the same temple. And yet Protestants, who profess to be far in advance of Catholics, prate rhetorically about the "one Shepherd" and "the one fold." Actually, there are as many Christs as there are denominations. The opinions of fallible men have wrought out all this mischief. Godless schismatics and daring adventurers, seeking power and applause and leadership, have permitted the Philistines to invade the Church and to steal away the Ark of God. Is the Bible a myth? Is conversion a puzzle? Is redemption a riddle? the atonement a fable? the service of Christ a cheat? and the future a chimera? that the seamless robe of Christ should be torn into a thousand fragments. We exclaim, most emphatically, no! We read the harmonious testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and by searching these Scriptures, as enjoined by the Great Teacher, we learn that Christ is the Son of God, and the Savior of the world. The apostle John tells us in a few words how men are made believers. "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these *are written*, that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you might have life through his name." (John xx, 30, 31.) From which it is clearly seen that no man can believe in the Messiah except as he receives him through these divine testimonies, exclusive of an abstract and mysterious power, out of which all delusions and hallucinations have sprung. Having become a firm believer in Christ as our Savior—as our prophet, priest, and king,—we next invade that book, called Acts of Apostles, that we may know how the apostles preached, and how, under their preaching, so many thousands became Christians. The people—Jews and Gentiles—received Christ upon testimony, believed in Christ, were baptized into Christ, and joined themselves to the disciples of Christ. Thus they became constituent members of the one body of which

Christ is the head. Having become Christians by faith in Christ, and by actual obedience toward him, we turn over to the apostolic letters addressed to the congregations, patterned after the model congregation at Jerusalem, and in those epistolary writings find our discipline—a discipline for the training of the individual Christian, for the training of the officers, and for the culture of the congregations. In those epistolary documents, which constitute the Christian's discipline, God has given his people "all things that pertain to life and godliness," and every spiritual element, that "the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Can uninspired men improve on the divine arrangement? And yet the country is flooded with amendments and helps to a system of things which is theoretically, at least, acknowledged to be perfect. Where did the great Head of the Church ever delegate to any set of men, since the time when the apostles set every thing in order, the power to make confessions of faith, to formulate creeds, to erect Church standards, to adopt Church politics, all of which are not only contradictory to one another, but all of which antagonize the Word of God, and render it void and non-effectual. If, as Protestant denominations declare in press and pulpit, they are "one in Christ," and all brethren in the one family of God, why do they not "all speak the same things?" Why are they not all of "the same mind?" Why do they not all "walk by the same rule?" Why are they not "joined together in the same judgment?" Why do they not all "imitate Christ?" If they can honor God and live the Christian life without sailing under Episcopalian colors, without training under the Presbyterian banner, without tenting in the camp of Methodism, without following the trail of Lutherans, and without bearing on their bare backs a Baptist shell, why not throw all that lumber overboard, and be Christians in the true sense of the word? The very fact that they glory in these names—the nomenclature of Spiritual Babylon—convinces us of their insincerity in seeking Christian unity. While professing to be "*spiritually* united," because they can not *ecclesiastically* harmonize, they live in constant fear of each other; and rather than give up popularity and walk with Christ—walk in the pure light of God—they willfully adhere to what they know are disturbing elements to the peace of the Church. In this state of mind they are neither "spiritually united" nor ecclesiastically. When

all these parties as individuals shall come to be united in Christ, their Spiritual head, (and we think we see the golden day approaching) all this ecclesiastical machinery will be relegated to the dark dominions of Babylon, whence they came. Christianity stands still until this turn is made. It is the love of power and the pride of ecclesiasticism which prevent the consummation of Christian unity.

The apostle Paul summarizes "the unity of the Spirit" by declaring to the Church at Ephesus that "there is one body and one Spirit, . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God, and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in [you] all." The disciples of Christ constitute the one body. Every penitent believer baptized into Christ at once becomes a member of the one body, which is spiritual body, and not a visible organic body, like an earthly government whose ruler is present and visible. The disciples of Christ, having been made free from sin by the truth, form themselves into a little republic under Christ—a simple congregation of believers—without the supervision of a pope or prelate, and without the sanction of self-constituted councils or synods; select their own spiritual rulers as officers of the congregation; and because "the Son has made them free," they live in peace; they walk in the light; they fear God; they love the brethren; and "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

Denominationalism has made sad havoc of the body of Christ. Nothing in the New Testament is made more distinctly visible than the fact that the body of Christ is a grand and sublime unit. This unit is entirely absent in the multifarious and dissimilar denominations of the present day. Placed in contrast with the apostolic Church they are a sin and a shame and a sham. The apostle Paul distinguishes between a local congregation of believers, and the one body as an aggregation of all the believers. The aggregate Church is always represented as one body, of which Christ is the one head. But what, in Protestant parlance, is called "branches of the Church," are, all of them, distinct and separate and incongruous ecclesiasticisms, dissimilar to each other, and of course dissimilar to the Church of Christ. Each one is ruled by a distinct polity; and each one breathes an alien spirit, so alien as to be savagely repellent of every other denominational spirit. Let Paul tell us what he means by the one body: "For as we have many members in one body, and all

members have not the same office ; so we, being many, are *one body in Christ*, and every one members one of another." (Rom. xii, 4, 5.) "For as the body is one, and has many members, and all the members of that [one] body being many, are one body ; so also is Christ"—a body constituted of regenerated men and women, and not of sectarian denominations representing divers and contradictory creeds : "For by one Spirit were we all baptized into *one body*. . . . For *the body* is not one member, but many. . . . But God has tempered *the body* together, having given more abundant honor to that part which lacked, that there should be no schism in *the body* ; but that the members [believing men and women, and not distinct religious bodies] should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it ; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now, *you are the body of Christ*, and members in particular." (1 Cor. xii.) Paul, in his letter to the Ephesian congregation, uses a variety of figures to represent this unit, such as "an holy temple of the Lord ;" "the building ;" "an habitation of God ;" "one new man ;" "a holy temple in the Lord ;" etc. God "gave Christ to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body." Again, in the same Epistle : "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is *the head of the Church* [the ecclesia,—the congregation or assembly of the saints]. . . . Therefore, as *the Church* is subject to Christ, so let wives be [subject] to their own husbands. . . . Husbands love your wives, even as Christ loved *the Church*, and gave himself for it. . . . That he might present it to himself a glorious Church. . . . For no man ever yet hated his own flesh ; but nourishes and cherishes it, even as the Lord [nourishes and cherishes] the Church." In 1 Timothy iii, 15, Paul represents the one body as "the House of God ;" "the Church of the living God." The members of the local congregations—erroneously called Churches—having received "the same precious faith," and having, on profession, been baptized into Christ, as the Israelites "were all baptized into [*eis*] Moses in the cloud and in the sea," they, of course, had become members of Christ's body before taking membership in the local congregation. The congregation at Corinth was severely reprimanded by the apostle Paul, because some of its members made an attempt to destroy the unity of the Spirit by seeking the leader-

ship of men instead of the leadership of the Lord. (See first and third chapters of First Corinthians.)

The Spirit of Christ is a unit, and is just as different from the spirit of Romanism as the spirit of Romanism is different from Presbyterianism; and just as different from the spirit of Methodism, as the essential spirit of Methodism is repellent of the spirit of Universalism; and just as different from the differential spirit of Unitarianism as the latter is antagonistic to the spirit of Calvinism. If all the denominations receive the Word of God as authentic, inspired, and therefore authoritative, what is the mystic influence that causes each separate "branch" to breathe an afflatus distinct and peculiar from all the rest? Each denomination is idiosyncratic. We answer our own question by replying that the denominations are vastly more concerned about preserving and maintaining their idiosyncratic features—their Church politics, their Church standards, their Church formularies, and their own separate schools of theology—than they are concerned about the beauty and purity and loveliness of the Lamb's wife. They keep up endless disputes on doctrinal and governmental questions, subtle and intricate, metaphysical and *twistical*, and not one of which is discovered upon the pages of inspiration.

In seeking to solve the problem of the age (the union of God's people on a common basis), instead of resorting to the Living Oracles for the solvent, the religious leaders of the denominations study the opinions of theologians, invade ecclesiastical history, dive into theological works containing the crude lucubrations of blind bigots, consult the decrees of councils, and hold "union meetings," where the Word of God is never appealed to as the full and final arbiter of the vexed question. This is the delusion of denominationalism, that while theoretically advocating the necessity of union in Christ, there is not one who proposes the Bible as the unexceptionable basis; there is not one who proposes to yield up the sectarian name, throw overboard the lumber and the flummery of ecclesiasticism, and, as a freeman of Christ, who rejoices in the truth more than in all tradition, plants himself once and forever upon the one foundation.

Just as long as Protestants continue to call themselves, distinctively, Lutherans, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, Unitarians, Trinitarians, Universalists, and members of the Reformed Church (as if the Church of Christ could be *reformed*), just so long the

discouraged and incredulous world must await the grand consummation. Who dare deny that there is a spirit in the Episcopal Church that is not the same as the Spirit of Christ; that there is a distinct and peculiar spirit of Presbyterianism that is not identical with the Spirit of the Apostolic Church; that there is the spirit of Methodism which directly contravenes the Word of God; that there is the spirit of Romanism which despises the authority and precepts of Jesus Christ: each separate denomination being molded and colored and guided and fortified more by the polity and policy of the distinct sect than by the neutralizing Spirit of Christianity. Until these spirits are cast out, and the Spirit of Christ supremely enthroned in every heart, it is mocking God and insulting the Head of the Church to talk and write about Christian Union. One thing may be relied on, that the basis of Christian Union never can be found in any one of the denominations. Not one of the Protestant denominations is identical with the Church of Christ as founded by the apostles. Either the name is wrong, or the baptism is wrong, or the mode of conversion is wrong, or sense is substituted for faith, or something has been added to or subtracted from the Word of God, or the Confession or Prayer-book takes the place of the Bible, or the form of Church government is anti-apostolic. All these obstacles must be removed out of the way before the Christian world can become one in Christ Jesus. We have long been satisfied that nothing short of disintegration will inaugurate the auspicious period. The leaven of Christ is working effectually in the Churches of America. The Old Catholics in Germany, having formally separated from the Ultramontanes, and having absolved themselves from the doctrinal absurdities of the Papacy, announce through their general councils that they intend to return to apostolic usage; and, also, that they are not satisfied to stand even upon Protestant ground; they even talk about the independency of the individual congregations, as decreed by the Prussian Government; but as long as they are hampered with their present ecclesiastical machinery, and as long as they will not in fact and form give up episcopal centralization, they can not expect to restore the primitive apostolic order of things. But, nevertheless, the very fact that they advocate the "Unity of the Spirit," as set forth by apostolic teaching, though the consummation is yet in the hazy distance, imparts to the plea a moral momentum that will have a telling

effect upon the religious world. In painful contrast with this bold movement in Europe is the fact that the Episcopalians of the United States, in their convention in the city of New York, spent the whole month of last October wrangling over ritualism, patching up the Book of Prayer (the product of weak fallible men), and voting on the merits of a man who should occupy some Western diocese as a blameless bishop! The Book of Prayer, and not the Bible, occupied their entire time. And yet they profess to be, *par excellence*, the Holy Apostolic Church of Christ, assuming to legislate instead of Christ, while they theoretically acknowledge the perfection of the Christian system as completed by the apostles, and professing, with Protestants in common, that "the work of the ministry" was perfected in that day, and that all had "come into the unity of the faith [the divine arrangement], and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a *perfect man*, unto the measure of the stature of *the fullness* of Christ." And yet these divines would essay to improve the form and features of a "perfect man!" Such vulgar acts are a travesty on the Gospel of Christ. No wonder that Jesus of Nazareth is every day put to an open shame by the reckless and thoughtless rabble.

We give it as our decided opinion that, as long as Romanists will not yield up the spirit of Romanism for the honor of Christ, and Lutherans will not yield up the spirit of Luther in honor of the Word of God, and Episcopalians refuse to exorcise the demon of Episcopacy, and Presbyterians persistently cling to the obstinate spirit of Calvin, in opposition to "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," and Methodists glory in the spirit of Methodism instead of "glorying in Christ," we repeat that, as long as these and other Protestant Churches prefer to live and breathe in a pandemonium of sectarian strife, "the unity of the Spirit" can never be secured in that direction. God will bring other influences to bear: he will raise up a more honorable people. "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! Then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea," lovely, beautiful, fruitful, and resistless.

The Gospel of Christ is the plainest system of religion in the world. Let us summarize its simple elements, all of which are accepted by the Christian world, and upon which all the loyal subjects of King Immanuel can agree, but who are prevented from

doing so by the officiousness of the proud and ambitious Rabbis of Orthodoxy.

1. The Bible is accepted as an all-sufficient rule of faith and practice.

2. Christ is the Savior of the world—at once Prophet, Priest, King, Mediator, and Judge.

3. Salvation is found in obedience to the law and authority of Christ.

4. The authority of Christ and the conditions of salvation are found in the apostolic commission.

5. Sinners come to Christ through knowledge and the "obedience of faith," as invariably proclaimed by the apostles.

6. All who approach Christ—whoever "has heard and has learned of the Father"—approach him as the Great Mediator between God and man.

7. They confess their sins, and confess their faith in Christ as the Son of God.

8. As an evidence of their faith in Jesus the Christ, they at once joyfully submit to be "buried with Christ in baptism," an act of supreme obedience which at once inducts them into the kingdom of God, and therefore into a state of justification.

9. The promise of God to all such is, that the Spirit shall abide with them forever.

10. They are "adopted" into the family of God, and become "partakers of the divine nature," after having been "begotten by the word of truth," and been "made alive to God" the Father through birth from the baptismal grave.

11. As such they unite with a congregation of Christians, with the view of keeping the ordinances of the Church, reading the Word of the Lord, prayer, the Lord's-supper, contributing for the poor saints, "having their fruit unto holiness, and the end eternal life."

During the ministry of John the Baptist, which preceded the public ministry of Jesus about the space of six months, the Gospel, *in fact*, was not preached. From the birth of Jesus until the beheading of John, A. D. 28, the Gospel, *in fact*, was not preached.

The formal founding of the Church of Christ did not take place within the three years of Christ's ministry, because the Jewish kingdom was standing, and the law of Moses was in force, until Christ

failed the Old Covenant to the Cross. And, besides, Christ was not glorified by the Holy Spirit until he ascended into heaven.

During the forty days that Christ remained on earth, after his resurrection, until his ascension to the throne of heaven, the Gospel, *in fact*, was not preached, because the apostles were not yet ready to prove that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God. As executors of the will of God, sealed by the blood of Christ, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, the apostles did not break that seal, and expound their commission until the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

As the founding of the Jewish Theocracy dates from the promulgation of the law from Mount Sinai, so the founding of the Gospel dispensation dates from the day of Pentecost, when the law of the Spirit was declared upon Mount Zion.

In short, the creed of the Christian, the mode of becoming a Christian citizen, the discipline of the Christian, the government of the congregation, and the reciprocal duties of the officers and members, are all found in the New Testament.

Therefore we conclude that, if men can not be saved by the "wisdom of God," through the "foolishness of preaching," we see not a gleam of hope in the "wisdom of men."

VI.—FOREIGN MISSIONS.

THIS essay on Foreign Missions is written in the interest of the perishing world. The subject herein presented should enlist the sympathies and united efforts, and call forth the prayers and hearty co-operation, of all Christian people. The Spirit of Christ is grandly and essentially missionary; it seeks the conquest of the world; it knows no State or national boundaries; it embraces within its holy purposes humanity, and inspires those in whom it dwells with energy divine, and incites them to put forth ceaseless efforts for the growth of the Redeemer's kingdom. That all men *need* the Gospel is a proposition that requires no argument; and that the Gospel, and the Gospel alone, is the power of God for salvation to every one that believes, whether Jew or Gentile, is an apostolic statement. The righteousness of God, by faith in Jesus Christ, is *for all*, and upon all that believe. "But how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?"

I. *The obligation to engage in foreign as well as home evangelization.* The first point I make and urge is, the obligation resting on the followers of Christ to obey, literally, and in the full extent of its meaning, as far as is possible, his command given in the commission. The parting words of our Lord to his disciples are these: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Those who believe and are baptized, and thus submit, practically, to Christ's authority, are to associate themselves and co-operate with other baptized believers in labors for the spread of the Gospel; and, in this manner, the entire body of believers is to be enlisted in missionary enterprise. As recorded by Matthew, Jesus said: "Go and teach [disciple or make Christian believers of] all the nations." He commanded that "Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, *among all the nations*, beginning at Jerusalem." He also said, just at the moment of his ascension, "You shall be my witnesses, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the utmost part of the earth." (Acts i, 8.) Now, as Lord of

all, Christ's authority is supreme. All authority in heaven and on earth is his. He is King; and I insist that this commission obliges his followers to engage heartily, unitedly, and with the firm determination to succeed, with the divine blessing, in the work of foreign evangelization. Does it not? Our King and Judge says: "Go into ALL THE WORLD." Who shall say, "We may not go: we may not even attempt to go," and be guiltless before him and loyal to him? The home field is important; not one whit less important is the foreign field. The Church, by her allegiance to Christ, stands related to the entire field; and, according to her ability, is bound to aid in its cultivation. Witnesses for Christ, preachers of the Gospel of his grace, heralds of the good news of salvation, bearers of the name of Jesus—the only saving name under heaven—to the world; to all the inhabitants of the earth; to "every nation, kindred, people, and tongue." Are we Christ's disciples? Then this is what we are to be, so far as our means, abilities, and resources will enable us to be. Have we been approved by God to be intrusted with the Gospel? Then we must recognize, practically, the duty to preach the truth, and make known the salvation of God, to every man, woman, and child; and, recognizing the duty, make instant provision for performing it to the full extent of our power, ability, and the means at our command. We must not confer with flesh and blood; but, in the spirit of entire consecration, go and announce the great salvation *among all the nations*. Our intellects, our hearts, our talents, our lives, our substance, our all, must be devoted to the full performance of the duty prescribed in this commission; namely, the proclamation of the Gospel, as far as may be, to all mankind. The obedience required is ours to render—is an imperative obligation imposed upon us by the great head of the Church; results, and the measure of success that may attained, are with God.

General Havelock was asked by a young man in India, "whether he thought the heathen would all be converted?" His reply was, "Obey your marching orders. Your King says, 'Go and preach.' 'Paul plants. Apollos waters.' God makes to grow." Yet God makes to grow only in connection with human planting and watering. No one comes to know Christ and the way of salvation except as he is taught it, or learns it from the Holy Scriptures. The whole world, mankind, all the nations, and in one word, "every creature

which is under heaven," are included in the commission given by the Lord Jesus, and are, therefore, objects of missionary effort. The field in which we are to labor is the world. We must "recognize the common brotherhood of mankind; not as a name or a theory, but as a real bond; as a bond more binding, more lasting than the bonds of family, caste, and race;" and, recognizing this, preach, labor, pray, toil, give, and agonize for the redemption of all. The mission of the Church—I mean the work given her to do by her divine Savior—is the conversion of the world; the enlightenment, salvation, moral quickening, and spiritual resurrection of every soul in every nation; in Asia, in Africa, in Europe, in Australia, in North and South America, in Polynesia, in Melanesia. Wherever there are human beings, East, West, North, or South; on island, peninsula, or continent; no matter how ignorant, degraded, or barbarous they may be; in "Greenland's icy mountains," or Africa's burning deserts, Christ's disciples are under lasting obligations,—they not only may, it is not only their privilege—but the obligation, with great weight and solemnity, rests upon them to go thither, carry to them, to all their fellow-creatures, the glorious Gospel; and, in the name of its divine Author, offer to them salvation and eternal life; and labor in their midst, and on their behalf, till they accept the offer. Every knee is to bow, and every tongue is to confess that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father; and thus "Jesus is to reign where'er the sun does his successive journeys run." Let us go back to the beginning, take our stand in the presence of the Master, and endeavor to understand not only the words used by him, but let us try to drink into the Spirit, and apprehend the inner meaning of this great commission, and the obligation imposed thereby. When our Lord uttered the words quoted at the commencement of this article, his earthly life and mission were ended. His toils, sacrifice, agony, sufferings, and death, were passed. He had left the grave. His resurrection had taken place. Many times, and in different places, he had manifested himself to his disciples, and had spoken to them of "the things pertaining to his kingdom." The hour of his ascension had come. He was about to go to the Father. He and they (his disciples) stood on Mount Olivet. They were in his immediate presence—on his right hand, on his left, before him. He made a declaration which reveals his own supreme authority, saying, "All power, authority,

in heaven and on earth is given to me." Therefore (that is, by the supreme authority given to me by the Father), I, the King of glory, the Judge of the living and the dead, command you—solemnly enjoin it upon you—to go, *go*, GO, into all the world; instruct, enlighten, and disciple all the nations; preach repentance and remission of sins to every creature; spread my Gospel throughout the whole world; be my witnesses, first, indeed, in Jerusalem, and then in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the utmost part of the earth. Are *we* Christ's disciples? Then let us stand where stood those disciples to whom our Lord spoke personally, and realize that *to us*, as well as to them, he speaks, and imposes on us the obligation to go into all the world and preach his unsearchable riches.

On this command of our Lord—the last command he gave to his disciples before leaving the world—I ground an argument and an appeal for *foreign* as well as for domestic or home missions; and to me the argument is conclusive, and the appeal irresistible. I tremble before this utterance of my Lord; and, in the depths of my soul, I feel that, in some way or other, we must obey this command—at least, make the attempt to obey it in some practical method—or come under the condemnation of our Lord, and incur his righteous displeasure. Do we receive these words as addressed to us? Does the obligation they impose rest upon us? Do we regard obedience to this command as, in any sense, binding on us? Are we, who are in the Church to-day, the successors of these men who heard the Master speak, and who "looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up?" Doubtless, all will answer these questions in the affirmative, and say: "We virtually stand in the same relation to Christ that the primitive disciples stood in, and ours is the duty to spread the Gospel." Then, I affirm, this commission lays upon us an obligation; and the great heathen world has claims upon us, which we can not ignore or neglect without at once jeopardizing our loyalty to Christ, our honor as believers, and our very existence as a Christian people. O this obligation! O this responsibility laid on our souls! We can not evade it. We must not attempt to evade it. A command has come forth from the eternal throne; has been given by the highest authority in the universe: Go into all the world and preach. Go and disciple all the nations. Preach repentance and remission of sins in my name to the people of every land and tongue.

How shall we obey this final and most authoritative injunction of our divine Lord? How shall we meet the responsibility hereby imposed? All whose hearts beat in unison with the Savior's command must form themselves into a union or association, in harmonious co-operation with the Churches, and as really a part of their organization, for "collecting and managing the funds which are needed to fill the world with preachers; with the Scriptures of divine truth;" and to build up Churches in every heathen nation on the globe. This world—this whole world—for Christ our King! The fields are white already to harvest! On all sides, from the four corners of the earth, open doors greet us. The harvest awaits the reapers; and we are to remember that, notwithstanding the "diversities of climate, language, and geographical position, Christian work every-where is a unit." Does Christ command us to go into every land and preach the Gospel to every creature? He has opened the way, so that we may now execute the great commission; and we are bound, by every consideration and aspect of duty, to do something—to do more for the evangelization of the heathen than we have heretofore attempted. "If we would stand acquitted at the bar of our own conscience, or at the tribunal of an intelligent public opinion, or at the higher tribunal of Him who will one day be our judge, we must—we absolutely *MUST*—awake to the importance of this subject, and take our proper place in the great Christian army, which is marching on to the conquest of the world." *

The apostle Paul was, undoubtedly, the ablest expounder Christianity has ever had; and, in his life, he most perfectly illustrated its spirit, and the obligation he felt himself to be under to Christ; and what was his feeling in regard to preaching the Gospel to the heathen? He writes: "I am debtor—*DEBTOR*—both to the Greeks and to the barbarians; both to the wise and to the unwise." (Romans i, 14.) As if he had said: "I owe it as a debt. I am under a great and most weighty obligation—not to my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh only, but to the barbarians, to my fellow-creatures of 'every kindred, tribe, and tongue,'—to make known to them the good news of salvation." Beyond a doubt, he regarded it as a great privilege to preach the Gospel of Christ; and in his work as a preacher, he experienced great blessedness; but he also looked upon it in the light

* Maclay. 1872.

of *meeting an obligation*, rather than of giving to a cause. Is there no obligation resting on us to attempt the evangelization of those "in the regions beyond?" The Gospel is for the eighty millions of Africa; for the more than six hundred millions of China; and for the one hundred and twenty-five millions of India and Siam, as well as for us. Jesus died for all. He is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. He tasted death (*υπερ παντος*,) on behalf of every one. (Hebrews ii, 9.) And on the basis of a world-embracing expiation for sin, it is the mission of the Church to preach salvation by him throughout the whole world. Do not we, as well as Paul, *owe* it to the heathen to go to them with the Word of life and the Gospel of redemption? The divine legacy of God's truth and salvation is ours only in trust for the lost world; and it is at our peril that we withhold sympathy or prayers, or, when practicable, contributions or personal service, from any part of the human race. Our King speaks in the imperative mode; his language is mandatory; and shall we profess loyalty to him, and not obey? Regard for this final and authoritative injunction of our great Redeemer, before whose judgment-seat we shall be manifested, demands that we begin at once the work of organizing and of training, as never before, the Churches of God for missionary work in places where "Christ has not been named." That people is not worthy of, nor justly entitled to, the name *missionary*, whose local Churches do not co-operate in the work of foreign evangelization. We bring just suspicion on our loyalty to Christ, and jeopardize our own salvation, in refusing to attempt to preach his Gospel to at least some of the many hundred pagan millions of our race.

II. *The Missionary Spirit—What is it?* How shall we define it? How may we know whether *we* possess it or not? One says: "It is the Spirit of Christ—the same Spirit that led the Lord Jesus to come from heaven and die for the sins of the world." It is true that the foreign missionary, the home missionary, and the pastor have each substantially the same object in view. It is to save souls, to plant Churches, and make the members thereof "shine as do the heavenly lights in the world." What is to be understood by a spirit truly missionary, in my judgment, is this: Standing in the presence of the Lord Christ, where stood those men who heard the words

of the commission as they fell from his lips, and accepting them as in spoken to us personally, and as laying, with all the weight of divine authority, a great obligation on our souls. The missionary spirit is the desire and purpose existing in the heart to obey literally, and to the full extent of our ability, means, and opportunities, this final command of our Lord and Redeemer. He who is under the control of this spirit says to himself: "Here is the Great Commission; in it the Master speaks directly to me. He devolves upon me obligations. He lays upon me responsibilities. I must meet them. Am I doing all in my power to spread his truth, and build up his kingdom in the world?" The missionary spirit awakens concern, and even anxiety, in regard to personal obligations. It seeks to enlist and organize Christians in large bodies, with the declared and earnest purpose of a universal diffusion of the Gospel. It openly avows that the Redeemer's kingdom must, if possible, and as soon as possible, be made co-extensive with the earth. The conquest of the world is the end at which it aims. True, this spirit manifests itself in preaching, and in sustaining those who preach the Gospel at home, and in all earnest efforts for the conversion of sinners; but there is not a full manifestation of it, unless, by its influence, we are led to go forth into the great heathen world, and give the "light of life to them who sit in darkness, and in the region and shadow of death."

III. *The Development of a Missionary Spirit in the Churches.* It is evident that this is a thing of growth and development. It may be cultivated to a high degree, so that it shall bear a rich fruitage, or it may be left undeveloped. Now, whether or not there shall be a growing interest in the prosecution of missionary enterprises, and the development of a thoroughly missionary spirit in the Churches, rests, primarily and chiefly, with the ministers and pastors. They are to watch for souls as "those who must give account." The end of all their ministrations is, "that they may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." And in order to this, they must teach, "reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering," and develop in the members of their respective congregations all the fruits of righteousness and of the Spirit. It is doubtless true that they do not instruct the Churches sufficiently, in reference to their obligations to contribute of their substance for spreading the Gospel in the "regions beyond."

They do not ask regularly for contributions to promote the objects of Christian benevolence. There is failure here in too many instances. The training of the Churches for the work of missions, and of sending the bread of life to those perishing for want of it, scarcely forms any part of our conceptions of the pastoral duty; and yet it is a most important part of our duty. Who does this as he should and as he might? Who trains, disciplines, schools, and educates the Church of which the Holy Spirit has made him an overseer in giving, as a teacher trains a class in Grammar or Geometry? And it is astonishing how much a Church of poor people can give, and will give, if fully educated. We must realize the duty of enlisting all our Churches in missions at home, and in missions to heathen nations. There must be enlargement, growth, and development in this direction, or we will die. The non-missionary religions of the world are dead. The Gospel lives by growth. Now, as to the means of developing a missionary spirit:

1. Begin with the children in the Sunday-school. Teach them to give; ask them to give; encourage them in giving. In plain and simple language, show them the benefits and blessings resulting from giving; and how noble a thing it is, and how elevating to the character, to practice economy and self-denial, in order to send the Gospel to those who have it not. The pennies that children may be encouraged thus to save will, in the aggregate, amount to a considerable sum, and the spirit of benevolence thus fostered will be of permanent benefit to themselves and to others. The Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church in the United States received from the children, during the year 1873, twenty-seven thousand nine hundred and one dollars. Let every pastor and Sunday-school superintendent see that, regularly, every three months a contribution is taken in the Sunday-school for mission work. Educate the young. Let the spirit of *giving*, of practical benevolence, be cultivated in the hearts of the children. Begin the work of Christian training in this, as well as in all other respects, in the family and Bible-school.

2. Preach on the subject often, earnestly, tenderly, persuasively. Let instruction be given on the duty and importance of systematic giving, to promote the great objects of Christian enterprise, and follow instruction with appeal. Enforce the example of Christ, who gave

himself for us. Portray the superior blessedness of the giver to that of the receiver. Stir the heart and quicken the conscience, by inculcating all that is said in the Bible on the themes of benevolence and beneficence, and the duty and privilege of co-operating with the Father, Son, and Spirit, in the building up of the kingdom of heaven in the world. Show the sin of covetousness, the condemnation of the covetous, and the blessed results of giving. And if the public teacher be himself a giver, as well as a speaker, and is active and alive to the importance of all missionary work; and if, through giving, God has blessed him with the *spirit of giving*, he can speak out of the fullness of his own heart, and his words will reach the hearts of others. We must train the whole membership of the Church in the work of personal effort for the dissemination of the Gospel, and must teach all to contribute of their substance for the furtherance of the same blessed work. The minister who fails to teach the Church fully and thoroughly in respect to her duty and obligation *in giving*, is an unfaithful servant of the Master. He does not do his whole duty. He does not, as Paul did, "declare the whole counsel of God."

3. Ask for contributions. Take up these regularly, systematically, constantly. Do not omit this. By giving, people are educated, and become more and more willing to give. Some ministers say: "If I talk about this matter, and often ask my people to give, I will render myself unpopular, and my own salary will not be paid." Not a word of truth in this. If you are a good man, and act from disinterested motives, and a sense of obligation to God, your people know it, and will esteem you all the more highly for urging them to the faithful performance of their whole duty. He is unmanly who lacks the courage to speak the whole truth, and is not one of those whom God will honor. Let ministers be faithful, and study how to develop the benevolent affections of their congregations.

4. Establish missions. With such means as we can command, begin the work of announcing salvation through Christ to the heathen. Have faith. If a commencement is made by men of faith and prayer, the spirit of missions will grow and intensify in the Churches, and the men and means will in due time be forthcoming. The American Board has never been obliged to call home a single missionary for lack of support, and has never refused to accept the

services of any one who offered himself because of a want of means. God gives *means and men* to those whose fixed purpose it is to honor him in the prosecution of missionary work. The establishment of missions, and the firm resolve to succeed in them, creates a new and unexpected interest therein, and draws to them friends. Our Lord's promise to those who are seeking the conversion of the world is, "I am with you always."

IV. For our encouragement let us take a brief survey of *what others have accomplished in the foreign field*—what they are now giving and doing to sustain the work of evangelization abroad. The objections to foreign missions, and the prejudices existing against them, arise largely, in my judgment, from ignorance and the want of accurate information in regard to the great and good work being done.

The Baptists, whose organized agency for evangelizing in the foreign field, is the "American Baptist Missionary Union," have, in Asia, a membership of 25,000; 400 churches; "more than 500 native preachers and assistants," and 132 American missionaries. "Number of baptisms during the past year, 2,311." The third largest Baptist Church in the world is at Ongole, India, in the Teloo goo land; membership, over 2,000. A few missionaries labored, prayed, and waited for eleven years in that land before they gained a convert: then they began to reap, and the work has since been spreading with great rapidity. The immortal and heroic Judson toiled seven years before making a convert; but within the last sixty years, "the Baptists have made the Karens of Burma a Christian people." In Europe they have a membership of 30,000, and over 400 preachers; "Baptisms during the past year over 2,000;" and the amount of their appropriations for foreign missions the present year are \$280,000.

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the oldest organized agency in the United States for the proclamation of the Gospel in heathen lands (formed in 1810), "began with \$1,000 in its first year;" and now for eight or ten years, it has been receiving yearly about \$500,000; and the sum total of its receipts and expenditures in the foreign field has been about \$14,500,000. In 1869, this Board had sent out from this country 352 missionaries, and the whole number of laborers connected with their missions was 1,333: with 229 churches, and a membership of 20,788; and the

number of pupils in their schools was 15,491. Since writing the above, I have seen a brief report of the sixty-sixth anniversary of the American Board, held at Rutland, Vt., and from it I learn that the receipts for the year ending October, 1874, were \$443,924, and the disbursements \$436,590. Number of missionaries in the foreign field at present, 376; number of native helpers, 1,005; total, 1,381. A noble record!

The Presbyterian Church has missions and missionaries among the Indians in Western New York; in North-western Wisconsin; in Minnesota; in Idaho; in Dakota; in the Indian Territory (forty-eight laborers and a membership of 1,600 among the Indians.) They have missions among the Spanish, in New Mexico; missions in Mexico; in the different countries of South America; in Africa; in Syria; in Persia; in Turkestan; in China; in Siam; in India; in the countries of Papal Europe; a mission to the Jews, and to the Chinese, in California. In India alone they have 251 laborers, 22 churches, 677 members, and 7,092 in their schools. During the year from May, 1873, to May, 1874, the Presbyterian Church expended in the work of foreign missions, \$494,932.39, and received, for the canceling of a debt which the Board had contracted in previous years, the sum of \$123,503.11, making the sum gathered in one year from that people for foreign missions, more than \$618,000.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has missions among the Chinese in this country; among the Germans; the Indians; the Scandinavians, and Welsh; in all the countries above-named as partially occupied by the Presbyterians; and, besides these, missions in Bulgaria; in Denmark; in Germany; in Sweden; in Norway. Their missionary appropriations, for 1873, were, for foreign missions, \$373,825.75, and for domestic missions, \$511,120, making a grand total of \$884,945.75.

The Congregationalists, through the American Board, the Presbyterians, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, have, in my judgment, literally obeyed Christ's command, "Go into all the world," among all nations, and they are preaching the truth as they understand it, "in the whole creation which is under heaven." They, with the Baptists, "within the last half-century have translated the entire Bible into 39 languages, outside of Christendom; the New Testament into

35 others, and portions of Scripture into 48 others; making in all 122 languages in the great field of missions that have been enriched and ennobled within the fifty-five years past by having, at least, portions of the Word of God transfused into them." "The missionaries of the American Board have, to a greater or less extent, reduced 20 languages to writing, all of them, except one, barbarous languages."* The work of translating the Bible into the tongues of heathendom is chiefly accomplished. The missionaries of the Cross have done this. Carey, of immortal memory,—the "consecrated cobbler," as Sidney Smith termed him—learned thirty-eight languages, in order that he might translate the Holy Scriptures into them. "God's grace gave the impulse." On account of THE NAME—the only saving name—he toiled! And though when in England he proposed establishing a foreign mission the proposition was regarded as visionary and fanatical, he lived to see issued from the press which he established at Serampore, 212,000 copies of the Word of God, in 40 different tongues—the vernacular tongues of nearly 350,000,000 of human beings. He labored as a professor in the Government college, and as translator for the Government, and superintended an indigo factory, one hundred miles distant from Serampore, that he might secure the means to carry on his work. O, for a like spirit! the spirit of missions! The spirit of entire consecration, and heroic endurance for Christ! Great Redeemer, baptize our souls afresh! What is dark in us, illumine; and help us to accomplish something worthy of thy name, and of the cause we love.

V. *Objections to Foreign Missions.* When, in England, near the close of the last century, it was proposed to enter on the work of foreign evangelization, objections were raised. In the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the proposition was treated "not only as an unnatural, but a revolutionary design." One clergyman asserted that "to spread the Gospel among barbarous heathen nations seemed to him highly preposterous—that it reverses the order of nature!" Another pronounced missionary societies "to be highly dangerous in their tendencies to the good order of society." Still another declared that the Assembly ought to give the overtures recommending foreign missions, "its most serious disapprobation, and its

*Anderson.

immediate and most decisive opposition."* *Tempora mutantur!* Times have changed. We of to-day wonder at *such* objections. But is it not passing strange that any objections whatsoever should be raised against missions to the heathen by those who can read Christ's last command? Yet such is the fact. One objection is the expensiveness of foreign missions. Our answer is: They do not cost more than the same results achieved at home cost. Indeed, not so much. Some political economists tell us that every convert gained in heathen lands costs \$1,000. Grant that it does. Does it not cost a thousand dollars to build up a child into a Christian man in America? Yea more! In the words of Max Müller, "Every child born in Europe, [and, we may add, in America] is as much a heathen as the child of a Melanesian cannibal; and it costs *us* more than £200 to turn a child into a Christian man." What must be the state of a man's mind who looks at this great question of missions in the light of dollars and cents, and against the salvation of immortal souls balances money! Lord Jesus, give us understanding. Open thou our eyes.

The Presbyterians, as I learn from the last report of their Board of Missions, have an organized system of missionary labor in and around the city of Canton, China, "employing 13 missionaries, 7 native helpers; embracing 2 churches, an extensive hospital, a theological training-school, 3 boarding-schools, 15 day-schools, together with the work of several out-stations, colportage, etc.;" and what is the entire cost? "Less than \$15,000 per annum." The same organized agency in an American city would cost, doubtless, five times that sum. In the face of our Lord's final and great command to GO, how dare we stop to count the pecuniary cost of missionary enterprise? Indeed, the greater the cost, the better! The more we give, the more treasure we have in heaven. The Master does not say, Go, *if*, upon calculation, it be found not too expensive; but, absolutely and unconditionally, his order is, GO INTO ALL THE WORLD, and we must obey, at whatever sacrifice of time, money, life, or answer to him with whom we have to do. With this one word—*authoritative utterance*—of our divine Redeemer, I will silence every objection to *foreign*, as well as home, missions, or convict the objector of disloyalty to Christ.

A second objection: Foreign missions have thus far proved a fail-

*Anderson, page 21.

ure. A failure! The largest Church in the world, numbering 4,500 members, is on an island on which, fifty-four years ago, a missionary first set foot. That Church is in Hilo, on the island of Hawaii. In 1820, missionaries of the American Board landed, for the first time, on the Sandwich Islands. To-day, almost a third part of the inhabitants are members of the Church: they have over 30 native Churches, with native pastors supported by themselves; and those 30 native Churches support 13 native foreign missionaries in the islands of the Pacific Ocean farther west, in the Marquesas, and Micronesia; and in 1868, those thirty Churches on the Sandwich Islands contributed more than \$29,000 in gold for various Christian objects. Is that failure? True, the Sandwich Islanders have not the culture, the refinement, nor the degree of civilization, that America and Christian Europe have—these are the result of the growth of ages; but they have abandoned idolatry, have embraced the Gospel, and are in the way of spiritual training and development. So thoroughly, indeed, are these people Christianized that the American Board have withdrawn their missionaries from that field. "The whole amount expended in missions in those islands from the beginning, in 1820, has been only \$1,250,000. The annual value of their commerce to the United States is now, in round numbers, \$4,406,000. Fifty years ago it was nothing. What are some of the results of modern missions?

"In the first place, Christian work in the foreign field during the past decade has resulted in a greater number of conversions, in proportion to the numbers engaged, than has such work in the home field." (An inspection of the records kept in the Bible House, at New York, by the secretaries of the various missionary societies shows this.)

"In the second place, all the principal heathen countries of the world are now penetrated by the missionaries of Christ, who have put into operation the highest and strongest kind of spiritual influences.

"At this moment, over China, Japan, Persia, Hindoostan, Turkey, East, South, West, and North Africa, Madagascar, Greenland, and the hundreds of Pacific isles, are 31 000 Christian laborers, toiling diligently to represent unto sorrowful men the beauty of Christ's love. In these lands, schools, colleges, and theological seminaries have been established, wherein Christian education is given to 600,000 youths of both sexes. Outside the bounds of Christendom there are now established 4,000 centers of Christian teaching and living; 2,500 Christian congregations have been established; 273,000 persons are now members of the Christian Church; and populations numbering in all 1,350,000 have adopted the Christian name. In India and Burma alone are 7,480 missionaries, native preachers, and catechists; nearly 3,000 stations and out-stations; 70,857 communicants. The Baptists have made the Karens of Burma a Christian people; the American

Board has done the same for the Sandwich Islands; the Wesleyans for the Fiji and Friendly Isles; and the English Independents for Madagascar.

"No direct religious results from missions? What mean those large and flourishing Churches, born out of the very abysses of heathenism, in Australia, British America, Siberia, Northern Turkey, Persia, China, India, South Africa, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and the Islands of the Pacific? Over 90,000 Fijians gather regularly for Sabbath worship who, within a score of years, feasted on human flesh. In 1860, Madagascar had only a few hundred scattered and persecuted converts. Now, the Queen and her Prime Minister, and more than 200,000 of her subjects are adherents to Christianity. As the Secretary of the London Missionary Society has said: 'In more than three hundred islands of Eastern and Southern Polynesia the Gospel has swept heathenism entirely away.' These are but fragments of the testimony that is within our reach, all telling the same story. Instead of bitter jests, founded on ignorance, at the paltry results of Christian missions, the just expression of our hearts should be one of gratitude and astonishment over the marvelous achievements of these missions in actually Christianizing large portions of the human family. And they have only begun to indicate what they can do. Let us sustain them with new confidence, and the energy of our prayers, and the abundance of our gifts."*

In a spiritual point of view, modern missions have been a grand success. The Lord of all has been with his servants.

Viewed from a commercial stand-point, foreign missions have accomplished wonders, and their pecuniary outlay may be abundantly verified. It can be clearly shown that they "pay" as a business investment. They widen the domain of commerce. In civilizing the heathen we make them good customers. All the money that the American people send out to sustain missionaries in heathen lands comes back to them again, and that, too, ten times over, in the increase of American trade and commerce, incidentally occasioned by these missions. The advantages of Christian missions, aside from the salvation of those for whom Christ died, are civilization, culture, human ideas, general comfort, and with these a desire for an improved physical condition. These are spread through all the world and completely vindicate the wisdom of giving money to sustain this cause. One who has thoroughly investigated the pecuniary economy of missions, says:

"The day we Christianize a heathen, we create in him a desire for a better physical condition. One of the first manifestations for good among the Sandwich Islanders was a desire for clothing. The same is seen in other missions. In Africa, the naked Grebbo buys an English silk hat, and regards himself as dressed until his ideas of propriety demand additional articles of clothing. They see in the

* Christian Union, September 16, 1874.

mission dwelling and family that civilization is better than savageism; industry than idleness, and cleanliness than filth. So they seek knowledge and begin to adopt the amenities of life. . . . Soap obtained from America is used to remove their superabundant dirt. They see the impropriety of nakedness, and cloth and clothing are required of our manufacturers. Instead of floorless and windowless huts, they aspire to houses with doors, windows, floors, and furniture; and commerce supplies from a nail to a sofa. Husbandry is improved, and all kinds of farming implements, as plows, shovels, forks, etc., are demanded."

Why, the Zulus in South Africa, sent more money to Boston, in the year 1870, for the single article of plows than was spent on the mission among them for that year! One missionary in East Turkey ordered from America more than one hundred fanning-mills for the natives among whom he preaches. "During 1871, 25 grain-mills, 1 reaper, 2 Lamb's knitting-machines, and one hundred dollars' worth of outline maps were sent to East Turkey; improved plows, mowing and reaping machines to Turkey and South Africa; outline maps to Ceylon; and sewing-machines and cabinet-organs to various other fields." Indeed, for every dollar our people spend in Christian missions, they receive ten in return, as a careful computation shows. We do not like this style of argument; it is on too low a plane; but the objections of some can be encountered on no other. Away with the wretched cant, "Foreign missions are a failure."*

A third objection: "We have heathen at home. Let us convert

* *The Indian Evangelical Review* has gathered together the statistics of the various societies laboring in India in regard to the conversions from heathenism during 1873. It does not claim completeness for these returns, and, as different missions have different standards for judging of the fitness of candidates, the figures may not in every case represent actual conversions; yet they are sufficiently full and important to be recorded as follows: Gossner's Evangelical Mission, Chota Nagpur, 1,731; Church Mission, South India (adult baptisms, 882), total increase in communicants, 1,091; American Baptist Mission among the Telegus, 708; London Mission, South India and Travancore, 299; American Methodists, North India, 235; Basel Mission, South India, 228; American Baptist Mission, Assam, 173; Irish Presbyterian Mission, Guzerat, 154; American Mahratta Mission, 116; India Home Mission among the Santhals, 108; other missions reporting less than 100 accessions, 437; American Baptist, Burma, 1,044; Ceylon Missions (estimated), 150; making the total number 6,324. These accessions include some children of Christian parents, but the number is probably not large. During the eleven years, closing with 1861, the average annual increase of communicants in the native Churches of India was 938. During the next ten years, closing with 1871, the average annual increase was 2,784. The increase of last year was double the average of the previous decade, and more than five times the average of the eleven years preceding that. Other statistics are equally encouraging. In the years between 1850 and 1861 the number of native preachers, ordained and unordained, rose from 514 to 1,363; the number of Christian congregations from 267 to 971. In the years between 1861 and 1871 the number of preachers increased to 2,210, and Christian congregations to 2,278. These latter figures do not include Burma and Ceylon.—*Independent.*

them before we go abroad." I answer: The prosecution of foreign missionary work helps the work at home by its happy, invigorating reflex influence on the home Churches. The whole history of missions proves this. Would you make the home Churches strong, vigorous, spiritual, and prosperous, imbue them with the apostolic spirit in regard to missions; establish missions in foreign parts, and let them see that the work is being pushed vigorously abroad, and then they will give for *foreign missions* and give *more* for home work, *because* they give to sustain the cause in heathen lands.

The commission does not read: "Wait, remain at home, till all in your neighborhood, county, State, and nation are converted, and then go abroad." Nor can the example of the apostles be plead for such a practice; but its letter and its spirit, as exemplified in the life and example of the apostles, are these: "Go to the people of every nationality and tongue under the whole heaven; go to the great cities, the centers of population; of commerce, of wealth, and influence, and plant in them Churches, that these, in their turn, may become missionary; and that from them, as from a new center and point of departure, there may go out a life and a power that shall enlighten and save the surrounding population. This was the method of the apostles, and in this way only can we hope for the conversion of the world. Paul, for example, did not remain in Asia Minor till all the men and women in Galatia, Pontus, Cappadocia, Phrygia and Bithynia were brought into the Church before he went to Corinth and Rome. Not at all. He established Churches in a few central points—places of influence and importance—and then went westward to the great cities of Italy and Greece. In one word, every objection, by whomsoever raised, or on whatsoever ground urged, must fall to the ground and be abandoned in the presence of our divine Lord's imperative order, "Go into all the world. Preach my Gospel among all the nations." What! Object to what Christ has plainly commanded! Who that wishes to be loyal to the Son of God will for one moment object?

VI. *Reasons for inaugurating at once the work of foreign missions.*

1. Our divine Lord requires it. It is a plain inference from the words of the commission. By that supreme authority with which he has

been invested, he has imposed on his disciples the obligation to preach the Gospel, as far as is possible, to *EVERY CREATURE*. And this command, "Go," "Go," comes to us with an emphasis and meaning which it had not to Christians of former ages; for the Lord, in his providence, has leveled mountains, exalted valleys, and opened to us a highway to every land.

2. Without the Gospel, the heathen perish. Paul teaches this; and it was the recognition of this momentous truth that inspired him with such zeal and earnestness in carrying the Word of life to those in "regions beyond." Neither any individual nor the local Church can reach the foreign field; hence, the need of a union, a united effort, an organized agency, for that very purpose; hence, the necessity of an agency of the Churches for doing the work of the Churches in the foreign field. In no other way than by such union and co-operation of the Churches can we bear the precious name of Jesus to any of the unevangelized millions of our race. And we must cry mightily to God for the men—cry that God, in his providence, would raise up and call by his grace a new order of men—men who shall be as absorbed in winning souls to Christ, as worldlings are in gathering gold; and we must search for the young men, imbue them with the apostolic spirit in regard to missions, and train and qualify them for the work of preaching Christ where he has not been named.

3. We need foreign missions as a means of developing in the Churches at home a missionary spirit. Without missions to heathen nations we can not do this fully and thoroughly. So far from hindering the work of domestic missions, missions established and vigorously sustained in pagan lands will aid the home work, by increasing the interest in the whole subject of missions, and by developing in our Churches a spirit of greater liberality. The reflex influence of foreign upon home evangelization is very great; and, therefore, we must literally go into all the world, in so far as by a combined effort and an organized agency, it is in our power, in order to promote evangelization, and extend the kingdom in our own land. How was it with the Baptists? Marshman, in his "Life and Times" of Carey and his associates, says that, at a meeting of Baptist ministers in Northampton, England, about the year 1789, Mr. Ryland, Sr., called on the young men around him to propose a

topic for discussion, on which Mr. Carey arose and proposed for consideration, "The duty of Christians to attempt the spread of the Gospel among heathen nations." The venerable minister received the proposal with astonishment; and, springing on his feet, denounced the proposition with a frown, and thundered out: "Young man, sit down! When God pleases to convert the heathen, he will do it without your aid or mine." Carey went, however, as a missionary to India; and his going was the beginning of the missionary development in its modern form; and the Baptists of England were awakened to the importance of *foreign* as well as home missions. Upon the Baptists of this country the effects of Judson's going to Burma were similar. Foreign missionary work stimulates the home work. Not less at home but *more* will that religious body do whose local Churches are co-operating in the prosecution of foreign missionary enterprises.

RESULTS ALREADY ACHIEVED.

The system of modern missions had its origin about eighty years ago; and the success given thus far clearly shows the fulfillment of the Redeemer's promise: "Lo, I am with you always." He has sustained his servants; he has granted them a good measure of success; he has richly blessed them in their own souls; and to-day none are so confident of the ultimate triumph of the Gospel among all the nations as they who are engaged in evangelistic labors in Paganism. Have faith. O, have faith! The Truth, which Jesus brought, is *for the world*; and, if faithfully preached, will achieve wonderful victories. When Judson was asked, "Do you think the prospects bright for the speedy conversion of the heathen?" his reply was, "As bright as the promises of God." His was a living faith, and a moral heroism worthy of all imitation. He sowed, and others have reaped.

The first Foreign Bible Society was formed in 1804; now the Bible is translated into the various languages spoken by three-fourths of the human family. One hundred years ago, there was not a Christian missionary in the great heathen world. (Carey arrived at Calcutta in 1799.) To-day a noble army of about thirty thousand (missionaries and native teachers and helpers) are toiling in foreign lands.

Mission Stations	4,000
Native Church members	300,000
Scholars in Mission-schools	375,000

Money contributed in this country for foreign missions in 1811, \$1,667; in 1870, \$1,633,891. The American Board, organized in 1810, was the first foreign missionary society formed in this country; now there are about twenty societies in the United States, formed and sustained for the purpose of spreading the Gospel among "Greeks and barbarians."

Home Mission Societies	36
Preachers (missionary) in home field	17,340
Church members	600,000
Attendants on public worship	1,789,670
Scholars in Mission-schools	270,189
Expenditures in Home Missions in 1871	\$2,336,102

The above figures are a reliable approximation to the truth.

Church of the living God, awake! awake! "put on thy strength; put on thy beautiful garments;" clothe thyself with energy divine; and, in obedience to the final command of Him who will judge us in righteousness, go forth to the conquest of the world! No longer delay! Time flies! Death approaches! The judgment hastens! Let us arise, and, in the name of the great Captain of our salvation, avow our specific and declared purpose to preach the Gospel to every creature. Never did Churches, never did individual Christians, stand in such relation to the heathen world as now. That world is accessible; it lies on our very borders; calls from beyond the limits of Christendom comes to us with an urgency and plainness never before known. The mountains and oceans, which once separated the benighted nations from us, are leveled and bridged; and open is the highway to every land. If we shut our ears against the reiterated appeals for help that come to us from lands near and remote, woe be unto us! The Judge stands at the door. With unwonted emphasis and peculiar significance, He says to us of to-day: "Go, preach the Gospel to every creature." Shall we obey? Shall we *attempt* obedience? The world for Christ our King! The Gospel the grand instrument of conquest! Come, Lord Jesus! Come quickly!

VII.—THE BIBLE AND TRADITION.

A RECENT writer, in defending his reliance on tradition, uses the following language :

“‘The Church being the Pillar and Ground of the Truth,’ was the sole witness and only authority upon which the books were received as Divine. Having approved them, it did not reverse the process, and ask the witness of these books to authenticate its own Divine origin, and validate its ordinances.”

It is proposed to examine, as briefly as possible, the positions laid down in this brief, but significant extract, and the legitimate inferences therefrom.

It is taken for granted that the writer referred to agrees with all other intelligent persons as to the manner of the rise and origin of the Christian Church ; the New Testament itself gives so full details about it, independently of the inspiration of its component parts, that there can be no reasonable doubt on this subject. Jesus of Nazareth is an historic personage ; his crucifixion under Pontius Pilate is a fact, about which no intelligent man, be he Jew, Moslem, Christian, or infidel, has any doubt. Those unsophisticated and simple-hearted Galilean fishermen that had followed Jesus during his public ministry ; that had believed in him as the promised Messiah or Christ, maintained, shortly after his crucifixion, that he had risen from the dead, not as one that had been dead only in appearance ; not as one that had been merely restored to life by a special act of divine omnipotence, of which kind were the three individuals that Jesus claimed to have raised from the dead during his public ministry, still subject to the universal law of mortality ; but as one that was superior to the power of death ; as one that was not only immortal himself, but was able and willing to bestow the gift of immortality on all that would believe in him, and be guided in their conduct by the spirit of his teaching. His disciples pretended to have received the most ample proofs of the reality of his resurrection from the dead. They proclaimed it, accordingly, fearlessly before Jews and Gentiles ; exhorted their hearers to believe in him as the only means of salvation for time and eternity. Moreover, they

established the sincerity of their profession by submitting readily to ignominious treatment, and finally to death. As far as our information goes, their statements were believed by some wherever they proclaimed the resurrection. Those believers that had been Jews, continued to consider themselves Jews after their conversion to faith in Jesus, as well as before; yea, as better Jews, looking on Jesus as the deliverer promised by the prophets, and on their belief in him as a matter of course, as a strictly Jewish duty. They did not separate from the Jewish Church; did not drop the simple worship or service of the synagogue, although they held their private meetings, conventicles, as the followers of Wesley, for example, continued to consider themselves members of the Established Church; they left the national Church when they were no longer tolerated in it. In fact, this separation was completed only after the destruction of Jerusalem and its splendid temple.

Not so the converts from Gentilism. The new convert of this sort would no longer associate in any religious or ritualistic transaction with polytheists; here the separation was instantaneous and radical. The Gentile converts formed themselves, accordingly, at once into separate bodies, assemblies, or Churches; and as the thing was entirely new unto them, we presume that the apostles and evangelists who converted them, laid down for them rules for conducting their meetings, appointed officers to carry out these rules, to instruct the neophytes; in fact, to attend to all things required by the growth and well-being of the new organization. These things we should affirm, even if there were not a single sentence or word written about them in any of the books of the New Testament; but we find these very same things stated and restated in its different books. So far, these infant Churches had been without the use of any written document of the new dispensation; they had been formed through the preached Word, had been organized by apostles or their representatives, and, in case of any difficulty, difference of opinion, the apostles could be and were appealed to, in order to settle matters authoritatively. Such difficulties actually arose, great and many. It was not to be expected that men advanced in life, whether Jews or Gentiles, should at once and completely come under the influence of the new doctrine, which differed so essentially from all previously entertained notions and ideas. Moreover, the authority of the apostles

was not at once universally acknowledged, as the historical book of the New Testament plainly says, and passages in Paul's writings imply. The apostles themselves did not grasp the philosophy of Jesus' teachings at once; they were led step by step, by study and prayer, experience and help from above, into all truth. While the most independent criticism does not discover any contradictions in the different writings of the New Testament, there are certainly differences and variations of opinion there, which can be denied by ignorance or prejudice alone. As the apostles themselves thus differed in views and practices, their followers (the Churches founded by them), did so still more, forming parties and factions, which preferred one apostle to another, and, in some instances, failed to recognize the authority of some apostles at all. This state of things, as natural as real, loudly called for authentic documents, not differing, of course, from the orally delivered truths and tenets, but better adapted to preserve the original doctrine pure and uncontaminated, and to transmit it in its purity to the most distant generations. Any thing reduced to writing carried in those days a weight, an authority, of which we can, at present, scarcely have an adequate idea. While we now say and, unfortunately, but with too good reason, "he lies like a printer," the language of those days was, "where is it written?"

We find, accordingly, that the four records of the New Testament detailing, more or less fully, the life, acts, teachings, and circumstances of Jesus, were written comparatively early, for different sections of Churches, to be an infallible criterion by which the many pretended sayings, traditions, and teachings could be and should be tested. We touch here upon a point on which nearly all parties, opposed to each other in almost every thing else, agree, though their view is not only false but almost absurd. The view which we thus characterize is, that the apostolic Churches, down to the third or fourth century, were models of Christian perfection in every thing,—in internal peace and harmony, in their organization, in the spotless character of the individual members; and, stranger still, all organizations of our day profess to be exact copies of these apostolic Churches, from the most ultra Puritan sect or party up to Ultramontanism itself. The positive declarations of history, of the New Testament itself, to the contrary, have not a feather's weight with these fanatics. "It must have been so, according to our notions of

Christianity ; and, therefore, it was so," is their reasoning, and woe be to him that expresses any doubts as to the correctness of these positions. To these men, Christianity is a kind of charm that mechanically changes the whole man at once, leaving no room for the exercise of judgment, will, or any other faculty. The organization of the Church was likewise something finished from the start, as Minerva, full grown, armed, and equipped, sprang from the brains of Jupiter, so the New Testament Church sprang, fully organized in every particular, from the head of its founder. This view, striking all history in the face, totally mistaking the nature of Christianity, is not a harmless error, but an error full of mischief, retarding the spread of Jesus' religion and the coming of the different parties to an understanding, perhaps more than any other single error. This error is held by the writer of the extract quoted at the beginning of this paper. His whole article, throughout gentlemanly and Christian-like, is molded by this view, which we must characterize as the *πρώτον Ψεύδος* of modern times, as the fruitful parent of sectarianism, strifes, and schisms in the Christian Church of to-day. "The Church being the pillar and ground of the truth," was the sole witness and only authority upon which the books were received as divine. Having approved them, it does not reverse the process and ask the witness of these books to authenticate its own divine origin, and validate its ordinances." Here is the Church, not in a state of growth or development, not even a fallible body ; but full grown and developed, infallible, in the form of the diocesan, episcopal organization, just like Minerva, as she left the brains of Jove. *Whoever finds such a Church in history, and can reconcile the notion of such a Church with the mustard-seed nature of the New Testament Church, can find his Church everywhere, and can not be troubled with any of the difficulties that beset other children of men.* In justice to the writer whom we have quoted, we repeat that we do not charge this absurd view on him alone or above other Galileans ; it is the error of the nineteenth century, only held more or less openly and consistently by different parties.

As we would expect, from the nature of the case, we find the disciples of Jesus more or less docile in his life-time ; and after his ascension they equally vary as to readiness to enter into a correct conception of the spirit and genius of the kingdom of the Christ, of the nature of that Christ himself, and to lay off their national and

religious prejudices. Peter's and Paul's encounter at Antioch (Galatians ii, 11-15), involved infinitely more than lies on the surface. Had Peter's temporary views prevailed, the Christian Church of subsequent centuries would have been *something radically different from what it was, if it had not actually relapsed into Judaism*. That the simple rite of circumcision was not the point of controversy between Paul and the Judaizers is plain. Paul, without sacrificing his principles or acting inconsistently, circumcised Timothy, and refused to perform the same rite on Titus—yea, wrote to the Galatians those strong words: "Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. . . . Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." The intrinsic correctness of Paul's position, the calamities that soon after befell the Jewish State and Church, gave the victory to Paul's liberal views, so that the whole Occidental Church of the second century was Pauline.

But Judaism was not the only quarter that threatened to corrupt the simplicity of the Gospel. Philosophers, theosophists, speculative minds, embraced Christianity, looking upon it, not as a new religion, much less as *the* religion, but as a philosophic system, agreeing more or less with their preconceived notions. These men adopted naturally Paul's conception of Christianity; but mistaking his opposition to legalism, his views of liberty, they corrupted and adulterated the Gospel more or less. The persistent Judaizers became, in the course of time, Ebionites, Nazarites, and were thrown out from the body of the Church; while the hostile elements, coming from Gentilism, gave birth to Marcionitism, and the endless sects of Gnosticism. In the lapse of centuries they disappeared as separate organizations; but some of their principles became ruling factors in the dominant party.

As we know, from the writings of the New Testament, that many passed themselves for apostles, who were not apostles; that, on the other hand, many Jewish Christians did not recognize the apostleship of Paul; so we know, also, from hints of the New Testament, and the testimonies of the early fathers, that many spurious "gospels" were written, and attempted to be palmed on the Churches as authentic records of our Lord's life. Here comes in the action of the Church, of which it is said: "It [the Church] was the sole witness and authority upon which the books were received as divine." Had

the case been, as here stated, it is not intimated that the action of the Church made the writings divine, or made them something different from what they had been before ; but merely made them authoritative, by declaring them the genuine writings of the men whose names they bore. But the case was not as here stated. Most of these writings had been originally addressed to Churches ; as, to the Church of Rome, to that of Corinth, Philippi, etc.; or to individuals that held high positions, as Timothy and Titus ; and, moreover, these epistolary writings were intended, not for occasional writings to correct certain abuses or errors in practice or faith, but for encyclical epistles, to be read in and by the Churches, as we positively know from Colossians iv, 16 ; they became thereby known, at the very start, to most of the Churches, and were, to say the least, as *authoritative as the oral teachings of the apostles*, as any man is more clear and precise as a writer than speaker. We know, accordingly, from tradition, that with regard to by far the most books of the New Testament, there was no doubt at any time as to their authenticity (apostolic origin) and genuineness (preservation in their original form). As to the few others—namely, 2 Peter, James, Jude, 2 and 3 John, Apocalypse, and Hebrews—tradition or Church authority settled virtually nothing, the Eastern Churches differing from the Western ; and only when the period of stagnation set in, proceeding from a universal apathy to critical investigation, or from a total ignorance of the principles of sound criticism, the achievements of former ages were acquiesced in, and, in order to forestall all doubts or free inquiry, infallibility, founded on “apostolic tradition,” was claimed. That this statement is correct, appears from the fact that the Synod of Trent settled the canon authoritatively. But what weight has the action of this famous Council which vindicated for the Apocrypha of the Old Testament canonicity ? Not that of a feather, we answer. Even Catholic divines have to discuss the intrinsic merits of these books, and are worsted in every encounter with a competent opponent. Nor is the case materially different with the so-called *ἀντι λεγόμενα*. The judgment of Origen about Hebrews is true, that the sentiments of this epistle are Pauline, but the diction and rhetoric the work of another, no matter what councils, synods, or assemblies, even universal consent of Catholics and Protestants, may say to the contrary. The apostle *Paul did neither write nor dictate that epistle*,

except the inspiring spirit was master of a better Greek than we find in the recognized Pauline epistles, not to press the additional fact that the writer represents himself repeatedly as the disciple of an apostle. The objections raised by the ancients to the other antilegomena, and strengthened by modern criticism, are still in full force. From all this, it appears how small the importance was and is of what "tradition" did in fixing the canon. Many documents, excluded by Protestants and Catholics from the canon, as the epistles of Barnabas, Hermes, Clements of Rome, were called inspired and canonical by nearly all the fathers of the second century; and we feel like asking respectfully, but seriously, why this is so; that is, why these writings are nowadays not held as canonical. If the "Church was the sole witness and only authority upon which the books were received as divine," no satisfactory, no intelligent reason can be assigned for this fact. But not only this; there is no father of the second and third centuries whose conception of Christianity is held by modern Protestants and Catholics; one was a Chiliast, another a Montanist, a third a pre-existentionist, restorationist, etc.; they all plead apostolic authority for their peculiar views. Why are these views discarded universally, while equal authority with the canonical Scriptures is claimed for the same tradition in other respects? We wait for an answer. "Tradition" itself has radically different meanings. For some it means, not an independent source of information—not an additional *principium cognoscendi*, besides the canonical Scriptures—but it is the *sense of the Scriptures* as understood by the Church at different epochs; for others, it is an independent source of information. The Catholic Church holds both, teaching that Christ and his apostles taught many things that must be believed, in order to salvation, not recorded in the New Testament, which, however, were handed down in the Church (*tradita sunt*) from generation to generation. From this source Rome claims to have her seven sacraments, purgatory, indulgences, invocation and intercession of saints, the sacrifice of the mass, the sacerdotal character of Church officers, etc. This tradition is of equal force with the written Word; is called the "unwritten word." The former tradition Rome calls "Unanimous Consent of the Fathers;" and whatever deference it may pay to it, it places it not on an equal footing with the "written or unwritten Word of God."

Protestantism, at least historical Protestantism, acknowledges the former kind, attaching great importance to it every way, without dreaming, however, of putting it on an equal footing with the written Word. Which of the two kinds does our friend hold? "Having approved them"—the books of the New Testament—"the Church did not reverse the process, and ask the witness of these books to authenticate its own divine origin and validate its ordinances."

"The true question respecting infant baptism, then, is, Whether *either* the Church *or* the New Testament testifies to its apostolic origin. If *either* does so, it is proof enough. - Here there can be no controversy." This language is plain and free from ambiguity, A source of information, independent of, and co-ordinate with, the New Testament, is set up; and what more is claimed, what more is needed, by the Catholic Church, yea, by Ultramontaniam itself, to prove the apostolic character of all its practices, tenets, and claims? I would most respectfully, earnestly, and affectionately call the writer's attention to this point. We are, indeed, told in his article:

"We can lay our finger on the beginning of every corruption which arose in the Church throughout its history; but no man can point to the origin of the practice of baptizing infants; unless, with these fathers, he finds it in the very bosom of the apostolic age. To doubt or question it was unknown until the beginning of the Anabaptist madness."

We meet this proposition with a counter proposition; namely, there is no article of faith and no religious practice commanded by the Roman Catholic Church that has not some point of connection, or starting-point, in the New Testament, and is not attempted to be defended by reference to the New Testament. Now, if this proposition is true, and I take it for granted that this writer has read enough to admit its truth on reflection, his proposition is manifestly false. Nor would any doctor of the Protestant Episcopal Church, I presume, place himself on the ground taken in this quotation. Bishop Onderdonk wrote "*Episcopacy tested by Scripture*," and the Protestant Episcopal Church circulates it as a tract, with the reviews of Dr. Barnes and of "some gentlemen of Princeton" attached. German Pedobaptists seek to defend the practice of infant baptism from the New Testament alone; or rather, they admit that there is no passage in the New Testament which can be considered as referring to this practice; but they believe that there are passages which

contain the idea, which, in its development, consistently led to the practice. By practicing the rite of "Confirmation" they acknowledge that infant baptism is not *full baptism*; but that the confession of faith, which precedes confirmation, is an indispensable condition of valid baptism. The Protestant Episcopal Church agrees virtually with the German Protestants on this point. Why leave Protestant ground at once and occupy ground held by Catholics in opposition to Protestants? While I firmly and religiously believe that only penitent believers are proper subjects of baptism, I wish, at the same time, that all immersionists might familiarize themselves with the views of the German Protestants concerning infant baptism, being fully assured that the controversy about this practice would thereby be narrowed down and lose much of its asperity. Of infant baptism as practiced by Calvinists and Methodists I can not speak as favorably, all objective force being denied to the rite, and infants not being possibly benefited subjectively by having the ordinance administered unto them.

In addition to one grand error, mentioned before, I would mention a second one. While a stereotyped uniformity is claimed for, and looked upon as an attribute of, the true Church, the believers in "the unwritten word" are of the opinion that there is not enough taught in the New Testament to enable a man to be saved by it. Hence, the cry, Tradition, tradition! great is the goddess tradition! Meanwhile, the study of the Word of God is, comparatively neglected, isolated passages are seized upon as shibboleths, and the true contents (of the Word) are ignored. We possess four separate records or testimonies of the life of our Savior. Let the picture, as drawn by every one of the writers, be thoroughly studied in its leading features and details; then let them be compared with one another in order to form a complete picture from the leading features given in each record. That not every thing memorable about our Savior is recorded, is said by John himself; but enough is recorded to enable us to draw a correct picture of this unique man, fit to be studied by all men of all times, in order to be faithfully copied—enough is recorded to enable us, assisted by the writings of the apostles, to form correct ideas of his person; the nature of his kingdom; the qualifications for citizenship in it; the duties and privileges of its citizens. In the Acts we have epitomes of the doings

and preaching of the two leading apostles, Peter and Paul; and these short notices, and the epistles of Paul addressed to the Churches founded by himself or other (unknown) persons, confirm and illustrate one another.

The assertions that the writings of the New Testament were occasional writings, and not intended to be the rule of faith and practice for believers, is positively contradicted by some of the books themselves. The author of the third Gospel and of Acts claims a very different object for which he wrote: John claims a different object; and though it might seem that Paul's epistles were occasional writings, yet their import contradicts their appearance. The Epistle to the Romans contains a very full system of Christian theology; the two Epistles to the Corinthians discuss, indeed, local matters, correct abuses, but give us not only a full insight into the condition and affairs of this Church, but they also develop some highly important doctrinal points, especially the doctrine of the resurrection; while other epistles settle for all times to come the Christological, the Eschatological questions, and the Epistle to the Galatians exhausts the question, "How is man justified before God?"

Not that there is not enough revealed in the New Testament, but that what is revealed is not more studied, not better understood, not more conscientiously practiced, is to be regretted, and is the great sin of our age.

Certain Christological and Eschatological views have been surrounded with the nimbus of infallibility, no matter how unchristian, yea, how antichristian they are; and to express the least doubt as to their correctness, is enough to set an army of ignorant zealots in motion, crying, Heresy! heresy! Crucify, crucify him!

One word more to our good brother, with whom the writer has only a slight but pleasant acquaintance, and whose step he respects, even if it should have landed him on the shoal of Ultramontanism. The writer's personal feelings are kind, and if he should have penned a single sentence calculated to wound feelings, he should regret it exceedingly. Principles, not personalities, are under consideration here. The writer of the article from which we have quoted, frankly admits that infant baptism derives no support from the New Testament; herein he fully agrees with the greatest theologians of the century, who leave it to little souls and ignoramuses to prove infant baptism from

the New Testament, and pouring or sprinkling from the same source. They can prove as conclusively any other proposition from the same source. But these great theologians, in their catholicity, are firm believers in the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures; firm believers in the sacred right of private judgment; fully satisfied of the miry character of tradition—the unwritten word. Mr. Dawson, undoubtedly unconsciously, has left the Protestant ground at once; will be if he consistently carry out his premises, a high-churchman; and ere long, a Roman Catholic of Ultramontane tenets, for whom the Pope is the infallible exponent of his faith; the consecrated wafer, the real Christ; and the mass, the unbloody repetition of the awful act upon Calvary in the closing scenes of our Savior's life.

One needs to be neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet to make this prophecy. As the grain, so the stalk. Ignorant, unthinking men may hold all their life long contradictory views; but the cultivated, thinking mind can not. My friend believes in a *tradition*, which is a co-ordinate source of information with the New Testament; "the unwritten word," which contains the things taught by Christ and his apostles, necessary for salvation. This kind of tradition is in the keeping of Rome; and if he prosecutes his studies in the same spirit in which he has done it so far, disposing of a Neander and Gieseler and Mosheim with a stroke of the pen, yet all the time honest and conscientious, he will land, and that ere long, on the shores of Ultramontaniam, the only haven in which there is safety from the pernicious influences of the civilization of the nineteenth century, especially from the foolishly and wickedly claimed rights of private judgment and liberty of conscience. *Diximus.*

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*Christian Dogmatics*. A Text-book for Academical Instruction. By J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht. Translated from the Dutch by JOHN WATSON WATSON, B. A., Vicar of Newburgh, Lancashire, and MORRIS J. EVANS, B. A., Stratford-upon-Avon. In 2 volumes. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 8vo. pp. 818.

It is no longer doubtful that theological dogmas are rapidly losing their hold on the popular mind. Articles of faith, that were once held to be very sacred, are now regarded with little or no concern. This, by some, is regarded as a very healthy sign, but by others as a sure indication that we are rapidly drifting away into religious anarchy. It is not our purpose to decide which one of these views is correct; but the fact we have stated will scarcely be questioned by any one. Even the author of this volume recognizes, in the very beginning, the truth of all we have stated.

If our interest in dogmas is no longer vital, why, it may be asked, is a work on "Christian Dogmatics" in any way valuable? We answer, that *Christian Dogmatics* is quite another thing from *Theological Dogmatics*; and yet the word "Christian" is not sufficient to bring "Dogmatics" again into popular favor. The author defines Christian Dogmatics as "that part of theological science which occupies itself with the investigation and systematic development of the contents and ground of the religious truth which is believed and confessed by the Christian Church as a whole, or by one of its sections in particular. It must thus, as an historical, philosophical science, be distinguished from the Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments, as well as from the so-called Speculative Philosophy. In defining the word dogma, he distinguishes between the classical, biblical, and the ecclesiastical use of the word. He further claims that even the latter use is variable, and declares that it is "an expression formulated, as accurately as possible, of the avowed *belief*, not merely of the individual, but of the community." These definitions soften,

to some extent, the popular conception of the term dogma. Still, we think, it will be difficult to redeem this term from the degradation to which it has fallen. Properly speaking, Christianity has no dogma. Hence, the faith which it presents is not *doctrinal*, but *personal*. It does not ask the world to believe in a formulated statement of doctrines, but in a person—in a person whose claims on the confidence of mankind may be readily determined by evidence furnished in the Word of God. But should it be said, the proposition that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God," is a dogma, then it is certainly the only dogma presented by the Christian religion, for it is the only thing presented to the faith of mankind.

Here is where we think the great mistake has been made in the past. And, while we have not too much confidence in the present tendency to break away from old beliefs, still, in so far as this tendency is to accept Jesus as the only savior of men, and the acceptance of him as the only condition of entrance into the kingdom of God, we are free to say that we regard the signs of the times as hopeful; as, indeed, promising rest from the long and bitter discussions which have characterized the past ages of the Church.

All this, however, does not invalidate the claim of usefulness for a well-written book on Christian Dogmatics. Such a book is valuable in many ways. It is valuable as a history. The history of dogmas is the subjective history of the Church; and in order that we may understand the conflicts through which the Church has come, we can not ignore the vital questions relative to faith, that have so long enlisted the best thoughts of some of the best men who have ever lived. Hence, a well-classified and well-written work, such as is now before us, should be heartily welcomed by every earnest student and Christian thinker.

Dr. Oosterzee has peculiar qualifications for writing on the subject he has chosen. His thorough scholarship, his mental independence, and, above all, his earnest devotion to the truth, eminently qualify him to treat the difficult subject of Christian Dogmatics. For the most part, his candor is above praise. He does not hesitate to tell us that his views are chiefly such as are represented by the Reformed Dutch Church, of which he is a member. We should have been better satisfied had his work been less *Churchy* and more *Christian*. Nevertheless, we are well satisfied with it as it is, and heartily commend it as the best work of the kind that has come under our notice.

In his article on Baptism, he says that "sprinkling came into general use in the thirteenth century, in place of the entire immersion of the body; and has certainly this imperfection, that the symbolical character of the act is expressed by it much less conspicuously than by the complete immersion and burial under the water."

In regard to the design of baptism he rejects both of the extremes—baptismal regeneration and baptism as a non-essential. He says that “promise of salvation refers, as is known, to the *washing away of sin*; that is, to the purification *alike* from its guilt and stain. To us it seems impossible to separate the one from the other, and to see in baptism only conversion *typified* and not the *forgiveness of sin*. The two were closely connected, both from the nature of the case and in the promises of salvation in the Old Testament. The Gospel places baptism in direct connection, not only with conversion, but also with the forgiveness of sin; and the anxious longing of so many in different ages for baptism would remain absolutely inexplicable if we could not assume that in it they found, for their conscience, in the first place, a warrant of God’s forgiving *grace*.”

This language, we think, is justified by Scripture teaching, but was scarcely to be expected in a work issued under the auspices of the editors of the Theological and Philosophical Library. We need scarcely say that we are gratified to have these candid statements from one whose utterances are entitled to careful consideration by every earnest Christian and theological student.

2.—*History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science.* By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M. D., LL. D., Professor in the University of New York. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1875. 12mo. pp. 373.

AN impartial history of the conflict between science and religion is certainly greatly needed. That we have such a history in the volume before us will not be readily conceded by many who read it. That the volume is intensely interesting will scarcely be doubted by any one, and that it treats *one side* of the subject with singular ability can not be questioned for a moment. But that it is too much a one-sided view can not fail to be observed by any well-informed and candid critic. We think a better title for the book would have been “*Science versus Religion*,” for it is evidently written in the interest of science as against religion.

While we say this, it ought to be understood that we have no sympathy whatever for the dogmatism of religion, which has all along the ages stood in the way of true science. We have no respect for the dogmatism of religion in any thing. We believe heartily in the doctrine of freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and the right of individual interpretation. But this is a sword with two edges; it cuts both ways. If it condemns dogmatism in religion, it also condemns dogmatism in science; and it has just as little respect for one as for the other. The difficulty with Dr. Draper is, he sees plainly enough wherever religion has attempted to hinder the progress of

science, but he does not condemn with sufficient earnestness those speculators who, in the name of science, have sought to degrade religion. He gives us numerous instances where religion has thrown itself across the path of scientific investigation, and parades, with a commendable zeal, the final triumph of science in the instances noted; but he fails utterly to show how many claims science has made, which never amounted to any thing, except to unsettle the faith of mankind. It is well enough to tell of the ridiculous decrees of ecclesiastical authority against the discoveries of Galileo and other scientists; but a candid historian ought also to tell the story, how it happened that the Church was frequently right and the scientific speculators wrong. But this Dr. Draper does not see fit to do; and this fact at once reveals the prejudiced state of his mind.

There can be no *real* antagonism between true science and true religion. There may be an *apparent* antagonism; but this can arise only from our imperfect knowledge. An imperfect understanding of either religion or science, or both, will precipitate an apparent antagonism; but this will be removed the moment our ignorance is removed. We have no fears for religion on account of the discoveries of science. True religion can never be overthrown by any real fact of nature. But what we object to is, that the *speculations* of scientists should be accepted as authentic *facts*. Let science attend to its own business. Let it keep upon its own ground, and let religion do the same, and it will not be long before much of the present apparent antagonism will have passed away, and be reckoned among the fossils of a bygone age.

It should be stated just here, that Dr. Draper's main attack is upon that form of religion represented by the Roman Catholic Church. To a certain extent this was necessary, as this is the Church which is most intimately connected with his subject. But what he says of the Catholic Church may, with equal propriety, be said of Protestantism, except that Protestantism could not be guilty of the persecutions which the Catholics have resorted to in order to put down science. The Doctor has unbounded faith in the great and beneficent triumphs of modern thought. The following extract will give our readers a taste of the quality of his style:

"Whoever will, in a spirit of impartiality, examine what has been done by Catholicism for the intellectual and material advancement of Europe, during her long reign, and what has been done by science in its brief period of action, can, I am persuaded, come to no other conclusion than this, that, in instituting a comparison, he has established a contrast. And yet, how imperfect, how inadequate is the catalogue of facts I have furnished in the foregoing pages! I have said nothing of the spread of instruction by the diffusion of the arts of reading and writing, through public schools, and the consequent creation of a reading community; the modes of manufacturing public opinion by newspapers and reviews; the power of journalism; the diffusion of information, public and private, by the post-office and cheap mails; the individual and social advantages of newspaper advertisements. I have said nothing of the establishment of hospitals, the first exemplar of which was the Invalides of Paris; nothing of the improved prisons, reformatories, penitentiaries,

asylums, the treatment of lunatics, paupers, criminals; nothing of the construction of canals, of sanitary engineering, or of census reports; nothing of the invention of stereotyping, bleaching by chlorine, the cotton-gin, or the marvelous contrivances with which cotton mills are filled—contrivances which have given us cheap clothing, and therefore added to cleanliness, comfort, health; nothing of the grand advancement of medicine and surgery, or of the discoveries of physiology, the cultivation of the fine arts, the improvement of agriculture and rural economy, the introduction of chemical manures and farm machinery. I have not referred to the manufacture of iron and its vast affiliated industries; to those of textile fabrics; to the collection of museums of natural history, antiquities, curiosities. I have passed unnoticed the great subject of the manufacture of machinery by itself, the invention of the slide-rest, the planing-machine, and many other contrivances by which engines can be constructed with almost mathematical correctness. I have said nothing adequate about the railway system, or the electric telegraph, nor about the calculus, or lithography, the air-pump, or the voltaic battery; the discovery of Uranus or Neptune, and more than a hundred asteroids; the relation of meteoric streams to comets; nothing of the expeditions by land and sea that have been sent forth by various governments for the determination of important astronomical or geographical questions; nothing of the costly and accurate experiments they have caused to be made for the ascertainment of fundamental physical data. I have been so unjust to our own century that I have made no allusion to some of its greatest scientific triumphs; its grand conceptions in natural history; its discoveries in magnetism and electricity; its invention of the beautiful art of photography; its applications of spectral analysis; its attempts to bring chemistry under the three laws of Avogadro, of Boyle and Mariotte, and of Charles; its artificial production of organic substances from inorganic material, of which the philosophical consequences are of the utmost importance; its reconstruction of physiology by laying the foundation of that science on chemistry; its improvements and advances in topographical surveying, and in the correct representation of the surface of the globe. I have said nothing about rifled-guns and armored ships, nor of the revolution that has been made in the art of war; nothing of that gift to women, the sewing-machine; nothing of the noble contentions and triumphs of the arts of peace—the industrial exhibitions and world's fairs."

-
- 3—*Christian Theology for the People.* By WILLIS LORD, LL. D., President of University of Wooster. "Speaking of Truth in Love."—Ephesians iv, 15. New York: Robert Carter & Brother, 530 Broadway. 8vo. pp. 623.

WHILE this volume has been prepared with special reference to the body of Christian people, it is, nevertheless, well adapted to all students of theology. It excels in a very intelligible classification, and in the clearness of its statements on very difficult questions. Still, we think it is a book that the people will not be greatly interested in, while not very many ministers of the Gospel will care to go over the ground which it discusses. To write theology for the *people* is certainly a very bold experiment, and especially in the present age. Theology has never been a thing which could be understood by the people; it has been mainly the property of a few, and even these have not been certain concerning all it teaches. But the people have generally remained in blissful ignorance of what Theology is, and have contented themselves, so far as they have been religious at all, in accepting Christ as their *all in all*. We do not think there is much danger of the people ever becoming interested in the discussions of this

volume; but if such a thing could happen, we are candid enough to say that, in our opinion, it would be the worst thing for the people that could happen. The philosophical questions which have distracted the minds of theologians can never be comprehended by the people, and to have some indistinct or unsettled views of these questions, is worse than to know nothing of them at all. Let the people alone in their simple faith. They know what it is to hold on to Christ, to trust him for life and salvation. This is the great matter. To lead them beyond this into the hazy speculations of theological polemics, is to destroy the very foundations of their faith, and to give them unrest where they now have peace and safety. If ministers of the Gospel and professors in theological seminaries will discuss the recondite subjects of theology, let them do so to their heart's content; but when they bring their crude theories before the people, and ask them to spend time in becoming acquainted with that which can do them no good, and perhaps a great deal of harm, then we enter our solemn protest, both in the name of the people, and in the name of Him who is the people's best friend.

Dr. Lord's book is well enough except its title. Of course we do not believe all that is in it. It contains some of the most offensive speculations that we have met with for a long time. We will give one or two specimens. On page 407, we have the following, on the "Nature of Divine Agency in Regeneration:"

"a. It is spiritual as being congruous, both to the infinite Spirit, by whom it is exerted, and to the finite spirit, on which it acts. It is not a force, therefore, but an influence; not a force such as is necessary to impress or change a material substance, but an influence such as is suited to affect the temper, taste, or disposition of a rational agent; and through this his volitions, affections, and acts.

"b. This influence of God in regeneration is also immediate. With reference to other spiritual results less vital than this, the action of the Spirit is *per media*—through means and agents of various kinds; but here it is direct. Unless the whole view of regeneration herein set forth is wrong, this must be the case. The essential difficulty to be reached and removed is in the soul itself, and not in its outflowing exercises and acts. The influence, to reach this difficulty, must be applied, and operate precisely where it exists. If the water of a fountain is poisoned and deathful, no application to its streams can possibly purify and heal it. Any effective remedy must operate within or upon the fountain itself. And the supposition of this direct divine influence on the soul is rational as it is imperative. It implies nothing unphilosophical, but the reverse; that God, who made the soul, and every moment sustains it, should act upon it with or without media, according to its exigency, and his will.

"c. This divine agency, further, is efficacious. Up to a certain point in the process of salvation it may be, and is, resisted; but where God has so resolved, it will conquer. When the stage of conviction is passed, at that decisive point where spiritual death is about to give place to spiritual life, the action of the divine agent becomes irresistible. The gates and bars of adamant give way. The just now desperately struggling soul joyfully yields, according to that covenant word of Jehovah to his eternal Son, 'Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power.'"

This certainly is a most monstrous doctrine. If all men are not regenerated according to this, then, it is certainly not the fault of the men, but

of God, who has not "resolved to effect their regeneration;" for, when God so "resolves," "the divine agent becomes irresistible." If this is a suitable theology for the people, then we confess to have studied the Christian religion to little or no purpose.

4.—*The Christian in the World.* By. REV. D. W. FAUNCE. Boston: Roberts Brothers. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1875. 16mo. pp. 236.

THIS volume contains the essay to which was awarded the Fletcher Prize, at Dartmouth College, September 1, 1874. The scope of the volume may readily be seen by the provisions of the will of the late Hon. Richard Fletcher, of Boston, which provides for the prize which this essay received:

"In view of the numerous and powerful influences constantly active in drawing professed Christians into fatal conformity with the world, both in spirit and practice; in view also, of the lamentable and amazing fact that Christianity exerts so little practical influence, even in countries nominally Christian, it has seemed to me that some good might be done by making permanent provision for obtaining and publishing, once in two years, a Prize Essay, setting forth truths and reasoning calculated to counteract such worldly influences, and impressing on the minds of all Christians a solemn sense of their duty to exhibit, in their godly lives and conversation, the beneficent effects of the religion they profess, and thus increase the efficiency of Christianity in Christian countries, and recommend its acceptance to the heathen nations of the world."

We need only say that the author of the essay has kept steadily before him the provisions of the will, and has given to us a volume which ought to be of great help to all Christians in their struggle with sin. While every section is treated with such practical insight and wisdom that it is difficult to say which is the most important, still we can not forbear giving an extract concerning the Christian in his recreations, which, we think, contains much that is useful and common sense. After showing that we must have our recreations, and that these should be generally provided for in the *household at home*, he concludes by saying:

"In the whole matter of amusement we are to watch *tendencies*—to what will this or that thing *naturally* lead? There are sports and exercises which, abstractedly considered, appear fair and plausible; but which, when considered in their tendencies and ultimate issues, are perilous to the highest interest of the soul. And surely these, as well as open and flagrant violation of positive divine injunction, ought to be scrupulously avoided. If, for instance, games which do not necessarily require money-stakes in the family, but which would tend to such in other association where money-hazards are common—and especially if great proficiency in playing were attained by practice in youth—then to admit and encourage such involves tremendous responsibility. If concerts and shows produce tastes likely afterward to seek indulgence in operas and theaters, such ought, undoubtedly, to be avoided. And if dancing, however graceful in youth, leads to gayety of worldly associations and life, it ought not to be encouraged in family education and training. Whatever may be advanced in professed philosophy on such pastimes and exercises, they are so dangerous in their possible consequence, that they are to be shunned and not indulged. Wisdom subscribes to the saying, that it is better to keep far away from danger than advance toward it. In Mr. Wesley's words, 'It is not wise to try how much poison can be eaten

without being killed.' And whatever endangers the future morals and religion of the young ought to be prohibited.

"It was the testimony of James Brainerd Taylor that recreations, rightly managed, helped rather than hindered his spiritual life. Many can testify to a similar experience. If recreations did not do this, that were fatal to them; for they could not then be allowed. But pleasing to Christ when rightly used, helpful to one's whole being, and beneficial to us in our ministrations unto other souls, we enter upon them, not with any hesitating step, as if letting down the dignity of the Christian life, but heartily doing these and all other things, as in the sight of the Lord. Thus our recreations become not a worldly bait, but a Christian benefit. They are not outside our duty, but a part of it, and so we are the happier in them. They are not an end, but only a means. And on them, as heartily as on the more direct services of our religious duty, we can crave the blessing of God."

5.—*Life of Andrew Hull Foote*, Rear-Admiral United State Navy. By JAMES MASON HOPPIN, Professor in Yale College. With portrait and illustrations. New York: Harper & Bros. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 8vo. pp. 411.

It is, perhaps, too much to expect a calm, judicial treatment of the late civil war at this day. The prejudices excited by that war are still too vivid to hope for an impartial history to be written by any one who was intimately connected with either one side or the other. The present generation will have to pass away before it will be possible to have such a history of that contest as will be worthy to live. Still every earnest contribution in this direction will help the future historian to give to the world what is needed. Hence, we hail with pleasure the volume before us, not as a satisfactory treatment of the subject with which it is mainly concerned, but as a contribution in the right direction, and a contribution, too, which is highly creditable, all things considered, to the author. So far as it is a personal narrative of Admiral Foote it is certainly worthy of very high praise. Professor Hoppin evidently believes in the man of whom he writes. Hence, what he has written is characterized by a sincere admiration for the subject of his narrative.

Admiral Foote was, indeed, a capable officer, a sincere patriot, and a conscientious follower of Christ. He was not a man of large intellectual endowment, nor was he distinguished for brilliant deeds in either his private or public life. Still, he was a successful man. But his successes did not come so much in brilliant achievements as in quiet, but constant, laborious work. He was a man of talent rather than of genius. He did not originate bold and startling adventures, and then surprise the world by making them successful; but he took up consistent and practical enterprises, and by careful, patient watching, and earnest, honest endeavor, made these yield final triumph. His private character was above reproach, and his devotion to Christian principles ought to enshrine his memory in the hearts of all the true followers of Christ.

OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

1875.] *Hebrew History—Oriental and Linguistic Studies.* 125

- 6.—*Hebrew History from the Death of Moses to the Close of the Scripture Narrative.* By REV. HENRY COWLES, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1875. 12mo. pp. 419.

IF Dr. Cowles writes for scholars he has clearly mistaken his calling; but if his purpose is to clear up many obscure things for the benefit of the people and to furnish an easy reference for those who have not the time to consult larger or more elaborate works, his writings may be regarded as a success. His aim in the present volume, he says, is "to present the entire sacred history of the Hebrew people from the death of Moses to the close of the Old Testament. Its special objects are—to trace the hand of God in this history, and to suggest the advancing revelations made of his character and moral government; to develop the leading human characters, and the significance of the great historic events; to explain difficult passages, to bring out the connections between sacred and profane history, in order both to illustrate and to confirm the records of Scripture; to place the history of the Old Testament by the side of its Psalmody and its prophecy, in order to infuse into the history somewhat of its own living soul, and to give to the poetry more of its bodily form and earthly relationships, and to prophecy its due illustration and impression."

That he has been faithful to this purpose, and that he has in a large degree fulfilled all these promises, no one will doubt for a moment, after having carefully examined his work. While there is nothing strikingly original in what he has written, he has certainly grouped together the main facts of Hebrew history in a manner that can not fail to be of great assistance to the people in their efforts to gather a just and comprehensive knowledge of that wonderful nation which was for so many years under the special direction of Jehovah.

- 7.—*Oriental and Linguistic Studies.* The East and the West, Religion and Mythology, Orthography and Phonology, Hindoo Astronomy. By WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 12mo. Crown. pp. 421.

WE have already called attention to the first volume of this series. To those who have read that volume we need say little more than to announce the present one. Professor Whitney has peculiar fitness for the work he has undertaken. He has eminently a conservative mind. While he is thoroughly posted on all the questions coming within the range of his discussions, he speaks with a modesty that is truly commendable in these days, when assertion frequently passes for scientific fact. The contents of his volume are as follows: The British in India; China and the Chinese; China and the West; Müller's "Chips from a German Workshop;" Cox's

"Aryan Mythology;" Alford's "Queen's English;" How shall We spell? The Elements of English Pronunciation; The Relation of Vowel and Consonant; Bell's "Visible Speech;" On the Accent in Sanskrit; On the Lunar Zodiac of India, Arabia, and China. These subjects are made to yield essays of great interest and value to all students who are working at the problems that have so long engaged Professor Whitney's mind. It may be said that these subjects are no longer simply curious; but they have a very decided practical bearing upon both science and religion. Then, so far as we are concerned in this country, some of these subjects have a special political significance. The chapters upon "China and the Chinese," and "China and the West," should be carefully considered by our politicians, as well as theologians and scientists. The influx of population from China to this country has recently become a very constant and powerful stream. And it is well for us to understand the character of these immigrants as they may soon form an important factor in our population.

-
- 8.—*A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive.* Being a Connected View of the Principles, Evidence, and the Methods of Scientific Investigations. By JOHN STUART MILL. Eighth edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. Royal 8vo. pp. 659.

WE are glad to have a new edition of this valuable work at this time. The recent death of Mr. Mill, and the many notices of his life and character which have been published, have given to all he has written a new interest. His work on Logic has been before the public for a number of years, and has been both highly commended and severely criticised. That it has many excellencies can not be successfully controverted, and that it has many defects is just as certain. The utilitarian philosophy of the author, as well as his skeptical tendencies, is clearly traced throughout the work, while the concluding book on the "Logic of the Moral Sciences," is an effort to establish his peculiar theories of morals and religion. His work on Logic will always command attention, both because of its great value as a treatise, and the peculiar system which is taught. While we think many of his conclusions are fallacious, we are free to admit the great ability of the work, as well as its practical value in solving many important questions.

-
- 9.—*A History of Germany.* From the Earliest Times, founded on Dr. DAVID MÜLLER'S "History of the German People." By CHARLETON T. LEWIS. New York: Harper & Brothers. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 8vo. Crown. pp. 799.

SUCH a history of Germany as this has been for a long time greatly needed in this country. But it is especially welcome at this time. The

Germans have recently grown to be the most powerful people in Europe, and the German Empire is now the controlling political force in the world. And yet this is the first attempt we have noticed to give our people a trustworthy, well-arranged hand-book of German History.

The foundation of this volume is the "History of the German People," by Dr. David Müller. This book is the standard in Germany, and is held in very high esteem. While this is made the basis of the volume before us, Mr. Lewis has not failed to avail himself of other sources of information, such as the works of Ranke, Wirth, and Menzel. The work is brought down to the year 1873, and therefore includes a brief history of the recent war with France, and the establishment and consolidation of the German Empire. We regard it as one of the most useful contributions that has recently been made to our historical literature.

10.—*Grace for Grace.* Letters of Rev. Wm. James. New York: Dodd & Mead Publishers. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 12mo. pp. 341.

THE theme of these letters, as expressed by the editor, is "the life of God in the soul, as it is imparted, nourished, strengthened, and perfected by his abounding grace. They treat of the most intimate and vital relations of the believer with Christ; of the reception of the Redeemer into the heart by a simple, appropriating faith; of his sufficiency and power, when thus received, to free the soul from the sense of condemnation and from the intolerable and hopeless struggle for self-deliverance, and to establish it in the peace, joy, and victory of an assured and realized salvation." In a word, it is a book for Christians, and ought to be of great value to all such in their struggles with sin, and their efforts to get nearer to God. Such books are greatly needed to strengthen Christian faith, and to stimulate Christian activity. There is a large class of books, intended for this purpose, that are so good that they are good for nothing; but the present volume does not belong to that class. It deals with precisely the questions that the struggling soul is interested in, and often shows the way out of difficulty with surprising clearness. We are frank to say that we do not always agree with the doctrine set forth. But we do not care for this; for since the *heart* of the book is right, we are quite willing to forgive the *head* for whatever errors it may suggest.

11.—*Hazel Blossoms.* By JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1875. 16mo. pp. 123.

WHITTIER'S poetry is eminently American. He is heartily in love with American institutions, scenery, and life. He is never artistic, but always earnest. He has little of the culture of Longfellow, but altogether more

naturalness and more effectiveness when communing with nature, or when striking at the wrongs of society. His style is frequently severely simple, and his sentences are sometimes strong, as though they had been forged for cannon balls; and yet every poem is pervaded by a spirit of tenderness which often touches the reader to tears. This volume contains some of his finest thoughts. The leading poem, on "Summer," is beautiful in the extreme, while the "Prayer of Agassiz" is fitly associated with the memory of our great naturalist. The volume concludes with a few poems by Elizabeth H. Whittier, sister of the poet. The note of her brother, introducing these, is a very beautiful tribute to one whose sensibility and distrust of her own powers would not permit her to appear, while living, in the character which she was certainly able to assume. Some of her lines are altogether worthy of her distinguished brother.

-
- 12.—*Correspondence of Wm. Ellery Channing, D. D., and Louisa Aiken from 1826 to 1842.* Edited by ANNA LETITIA LE BRETON. Boston: Roberts Bros. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 1874. 12mo. pp. 426.

We do not hesitate to say that this is one of the most enjoyable books of the season. These letters are the result of a correspondence between Dr. Channing and Miss Aiken which grew out of the circumstance of his sending to her his work on "The Character and writings of Milton." The letters at first were somewhat formal, but gradually ripened into the warmest expressions of friendship and the freest communication of the sentiments of the writers on the subjects of Politics, Theology, Literature, and Society, as well as the manners and conditions of the people of their two countries. The letters are better than a biography of Dr. Channing. They are, in fact, an unconscious autobiography. They are the revelations of his real habits of life and thought, and have given us, better than any thing else could have done, the exact transcript of his great and active mind. We are truly thankful that these letters have been given to the public, as they are not only valuable in themselves, but will be highly prized for their faithful portraiture of the true character of one of America's most gifted writers.

-
- 13.—*Strength and Beauty—Discussions for Young Men.* By MARK HOPKINS, D. D. New York: Dodd & Mead, Publishers. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 12mo. pp. 361.

THESE lectures seem to have been prepared mainly for young men at college; but their value is not in any way impaired by this fact. We think their general usefulness is rather increased than diminished on account of their origin. Young men at college are typical young men. Then, they are the very young men who are likely to exert a controlling influence on

society by and by. Hence, what is said appropriately to them may be useful to young men in all the stations of life. But these lectures are not simply for the benefit of young men. They have a general application, and may be read with profit by all classes of people. Such themes as Receiving and Giving, The Manifoldness of Man, Nothing to Be Lost, God's Method of Social Unity, On Liberality in Religious Belief, Choice and Service, Self-denial, Higher and Lower Good, etc., are suggestive of a very wide field of discussion, and will give the reader an idea of the scope of the volume. It is full of healthful and manly thoughts, and is a book that may be put into the hands of any one with confidence that it will stimulate to a better and higher life.

-
- 14.—*The Genesis of the New England Churches.* By LEONARD BACON. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874.

THE author of this volume has evidently a heart for his work. While he has doubtless aimed to be a candid historian, it will scarcely be denied that he has written as one who has a great personal interest in the subject of his work. This fact, however, lends a peculiar charm to the volume, and makes it certainly more readable, even if it should be less valuable as a history.

Just now this volume has a peculiar interest. The discussions which are going on, both in Europe and America, concerning the relations of Church and State, make it very important, for Americans at least, to become well acquainted with that peculiar form of Church development which evidently exerted a controlling influence in the formation and development of our civil institutions.

Dr. Bacon's volume is intensely interesting, and as it treats a subject of great importance, it will scarcely fail to receive very general attention, and ought to produce a very decided influence.

-
- 15.—*Fillmore's Songs of Glory: For Sunday-Schools, Churches, and the Social Circle.* By JAMES H. FILLMORE. Cincinnati: Published by Fillmore Bros. 1874. pp. 127.

WE desire to call attention to this little book, because it is really a praiseworthy effort to give our Sunday-schools something very far superior to the majority of works of its kind. Its music is generally simple, and well adapted to the capacity and taste of children. But this is not its chief recommendation. The words are, in the main, such as children may properly sing. Just here we find our chief objection to most of the Sunday-school singing-books now in use. The words are frequently very foolish, or else teach a false view of the Christian religion. Mr. Fillmore has made

an honest effort to escape this objection, and we heartily thank him for the measure of success to which he has attained. He is a young composer, but gives promise of becoming distinguished in the field of labor which he has chosen.

- 16.—*The History of Greece*. By Professor Dr. ERNST CURTIUS. Translated by ADOLPHUS WILLIAM WARD, M. A., Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, Professor of History in Owen's College, Manchester. Vol. V. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. Crown. 8vo.

THIS volume concludes Dr. Curtius's "History of Greece." It opens with a very interesting account of the kingdoms of the North, and ends with the last struggle for the independence of Greece. In some respects, this is the most important volume of the whole series. But as all have been so scholarly, so judicial, so comprehensive, and yet so concise, we need only say that English readers have now a history of Greece which ought to take precedence of all others.

- 17.—*Animal Mechanism*.—A Treatise on Terrestrial and Aerial Locomotion. By J. MARCY, Professor at the College of France, and Member of the Academy of Medicine. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 12mo. pp. 283.

THIS volume is closely akin to the one we recently noticed on "Animal Locomotion," and is treated in the same masterly manner as that volume was. The "International Scientific Series" has more than fulfilled its promises.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*D. Fr. Strauss' alter und neuer Glaube, und seine Literarische Ergebnisse: Zwei Kritische Abhandlungen*. Von DR. L. W. E. RAUWENHOFF, Professor an der Universität Leyden, und DR. FR. NIPPOLD, Professor an der Universität Bern. (D. Fr. Strauss' Old and New Faith, and its Literary Products; Two Critical Treatises. By DR. L. W. E. RAUWENHOFF, Professor at the University of Leyden, and DR. FR. NIPPOLD, Professor at the University of Berne.) Leipsic and Leyden. 1873. 8vo. pp. 246.

No literary production in the last years has excited such general, we might almost say almost universal, interest in Germany as Strauss' last book, entitled, "The Old and the New Faith: A Confession." The excitement it has awakened has not been limited to Germany; Holland, Switzerland, France, and Great Britain have all felt it, only in a less degree than

Germany. An American reader, unacquainted with the current literature of Germany, in all its branches, can form no idea of this stir which Strauss' last words have occasioned in the great Father-land. A perfect deluge of literary productions has followed this bolt which the old arch-freethinking critic has hurled with his dying hand into the world around him, already so deeply agitated by the very questions he so daringly handles.

Some idea may be formed of the multitude of books, pamphlets, reviews, etc., Strauss' book has called forth, when we state, that the second *half* of the book, at the head of this notice, is entirely taken up with brief notices, generally very brief, of these "answers" and "reviews" of Strauss; and Dr. Nippold, in this very extended critical notice of these productions has, to our own knowledge, by no means embraced all of them; we have seen and read some, German and French, not in his list, and these among the best. And the end of these "answers" is not yet; almost every week is adding to the list. Every section of German thinkers is here represented,—Catholics, the *Old* especially; Protestants, of all shades, from the extreme right, of the strict orthodox school, to the extremest left, nearest to, or identified with Strauss himself; the avowed antichristians of every hue; "philosophers," whose number and variety in Germany is legion; and scientists, politicians, etc.; for Strauss's book reaches into all departments of thought, not excepting even "æsthetics;" for he treats, strange to say, in such a book, even of poetry and music. We find in this mountain of literature, every form,—journalistic articles, in the daily press; massive reviews, in the quarterlies; pamphlets, of all sizes; and heavy, tedious books.

This so general and so very spirited awakening excited by this book is significant, and challenges attention and explanation. First, by way of explanation, we may say that the German world is full of "thinkers" and "writers." This is the business of that nation. Its press is groaning continually in travail to give to the world the teeming productions of this legion of men of thought and of the pen. It is a welcome day when some such exciting marvel as this last offspring of Strauss appears in their midst. Every *litteratus* must *think* and *write* about it. A second cause is to be found in the questions Strauss discusses in his book; they are all of the class the Germans call "*burning* questions"—such as are at the present moment exciting the world. Again, the manner in which Strauss argues and comes to his conclusions has stirred up opposition against him. And, finally, the positions of the German mind on the questions he discusses are so multitudinous and varied, ranging in ever-changing shades from evangelical, old orthodoxy, to the baldest nihilistic materialism and atheism, and every position is defended by its advocates with such exclusive determination and violence against every opposing difference, that this book has, in something in it, come into conflict with almost every body; and hence, men have fallen

upon it right and left; while some, not the many, have noticed it only to sing its praises. It has few out-and-out advocates. We may add, also, that most of the attacks come from the rationalists and unbelievers.

The work whose title is at the head of this notice is one of the best of the class to which it belongs—the most numerous of the replies to Strauss. It teaches us a lesson as to the condition of theology and Christian faith in the Old World that is at once painful and instructive. We see here with what kind of armor many there are attempting to meet the Goliaths of unbelief.

Dr. Rauwenhoff is professor at the old University of Leyden, and one of the most eminent Protestant theologians of Holland. Dr. Nippold (pp. 131, 132) says of him:

"In Holland, where there is certainly no lack of eminent Church historians, the unusual importance of Rauwenhoff's explorations in the religious-historical field is so universally acknowledged, and the position which he occupies among the leaders of the strictly scientific tendency in Holland theology is so firmly established, that every publication coming from him, and especially on such a subject as the new Straussian controversy, is sure of a large and grateful circle of readers."

After naming a number of important works of a religious-historical character, that Dr. Rauwenhoff has produced, and that have fixed his fame as an author, he adds:

"Besides these, it is especially Dr. Rauwenhoff's contributions to the *Leyden Theological Journal* (*Theologisch Tijdschrift*), which are acknowledged as truly splendid "essays," and on the most important and difficult problems of the new theological inquiries," etc.

Now, how does this eminent theological professor, scholar, and writer seek to meet Strauss? We have, of course, room only to note some of the objections of Dr. Rauwenhoff against these last extreme antichristian positions of the old Tuebinger *infidel*; from these specimens the whole work must be judged. Strauss's book is divided into two parts, as its title, "The Old and the New Faith," imports. The first part is a criticism of *the old faith*; the second, an exposition of the *new*. Each embraces two questions: 1. *Are we yet Christians? Have we yet religion?* 2. *How do we comprehend the World? How do we order our life?*

Dr. Rauwenhoff's first objection, and it is one of his strongest, is to the method by which Strauss answers the first of these questions,—in the negative, of course.

It is plain, of course, that if Strauss and his party—the "we," as he calls them—could be yet Christians, in any sense, it would be only in what is called "the most advanced sense" of this word,—such Christians as, to use Dr. Rauwenhoff's own words, "Baur, Parker (Theodore), or in general, those of the most advanced conception of Christianity of the moderns." Strauss himself recognizes this, while he declares that even in these "advanced forms" he would stumble at many things. But, to the surprise and confusion of these "moderns," these rationalistic Christians of

the "most advanced" school, he adopts quite another standard of judgment. He declares that by Christianity we have a right only to understand ancient or primitive Christianity; not the corrupted, confused forms—the "mixed forms," *mischformen*—of modern times. He says: "Even in these (modern forms) much would remain inexplicable to us, if we did not have in our minds first, the image of the old Christian faith, at least, in its essential outlines; the modern mixtures can only be understood from the pure ground form." There is truth in this. Strauss then sets forth the elements of the "Old Christian Faith," on the basis of the *apostolic symbols*, or creed; and then, as this can no longer be accepted by him and his "we," he logically answers his first questions by a decided *No!*

Now, to this "method" Dr. Rauwenhoff objects most decidedly. Hear him:

"The result of this method can easily be foreseen. But, before we attend to the contents of this part, the question is forced upon us, 'To what end is all this exposition of the ancient faith?' The only point in question was, Whether the 'we' [Strauss and his party] could yet be Christians. Did any one, even for a moment, so conceive this, as if these 'we' could yet accept the Christian faith of the fourth or fifth centuries? . . . Had he taken for his conclusion or standard the Christianity of a Baur, or a Parker, or in general the well-known conceptions of the moderns, then we might—whatever would have been the result of his investigations—have conceded at least the honesty of his method. But, instead of this, he places at the beginning of his exposition the picture of a Christianity, which no one on earth any longer recognizes as his own. *No fair play!* When, then, the reader comes to the later forms of Christian faith, he has already had awakened in him a decided depreciation of a faith which began with such absurdities."

Dr. Rauwenhoff, we believe, judging from the whole tenor of Strauss' book, is, to a certain degree, justified in regarding this "method" as an artful trick on the part of the old unbelieving dialectician, that goes far to dissipate the nimbus of that "ehrlichkeit"—*honesty*,—which his friends have so long claimed for him, and of which he himself has been accused to make a display. So much, as against Strauss. On the other hand, Rauwenhoff abundantly shows, in *his* "method" here, how *he* "conceives" Christianity. For it is not simply of some of the things in the *Symbolum Apostolicum* and the "Old Faith," that he says what he says, and which he regards as "old lumber," as the Germanic "moderns" say; but he involves in his rejection, also, those parts of it—the most of it which constitute to-day, as they ever did, the essential, vital truths of Christian doctrine. To a degree, Strauss' "method" is right, whatever be the *spirit* of it, and his reviewer's "method" has a terribly weak place in it; yet, generally, his severe rebukes to Strauss are just. The justice of what we have here said will appear still more evident from the following passage in the same connection. Speaking of Strauss' process further, Rauwenhoff says:

"The account of the Creation, the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, the Messianic Prophecies, the fall, the devil, original sin, the birth from a virgin, the descent to hell and

the resurrection, the atonement, faith and justification, Church and sacraments, the resurrection of the flesh, election and rejection—are made, one after the other, to run the gauntlet of his system of criticism, and give the author opportunity for a number of his piquant observations, which might, perhaps, be quite in place in polemics against an orthodoxy which attempts to keep erect, unchanged, the old Church doctrine; but of which we may here justly ask: 'To what end is all this, if not to impose absurdities on Christianity, which it rejects?'

But there is another most capital point in Strauss' "method" against which our reviewer also vigorously protests. This protest further reveals the reviewer's own faith and method! It is of the highest interest to note this point in the present state of European theological controversy.

Strauss insists, with right, that Christianity is identified with, and rests upon, the *person* and *character* of Christ; with Christ it stands or falls. Then he proceeds to *destroy* this person and character as conceived, taught, and believed, in the New Testament and in the Church. This done, and with him, logically, Christianity falls. Our reviewer objects, *in toto*, to this method; he denies the premises, and so the conclusion. At the risk even of extending too long this notice, we give the whole of this remarkable passage. Our author begins by setting forth Strauss' reasoning thus:

"It is no accident that the controversy about the value of Christianity—the longer, the more—is concentrated in the question of the person of its Founder. Had we to do with some object of science or art, such a question would have little concern for us. The image of Hamlet remains equally valuable to us, even if we know but little of the person of the poet. The scientific merits of Lord Bacon suffer not the least from all the unfavorable things which we know of his character. Even the persons of Moses and Mohammed have little significance in the estimation we put on the religions established by them, precisely because they were mere *founders* of religions, who, after they drew away the curtain from the new revelation, themselves stood aside. But it is quite otherwise with the Christian religion. Here the Founder is, at the same time, the object of the religion; and the faith founded on him loses the ground under its feet, as soon as it is clear that he did not personally possess the qualities which are necessary for a being that is to be the object of a religion. This has really long since been a decided matter; for only a divine being can be the object of religious veneration; and to regard the Author of Christianity as such, has long since been given up by all thinking persons. Now it is said, it is true, that he never claimed this for himself; that his deification arose later in the Church; and that, if we really regard him as man, we occupy the ground which he occupied himself. But grant even that this be true, yet the whole institution of our Churches, the Protestant as well as the Catholic, is calculated on the other stand-point. The Christian cultus (this garment that is made for a God-man) hangs loosely, and loses all form and fitness as soon as it is put on a common man."

Our reviewer objects to this reasoning. He insists that Strauss should have proceeded here as in questions of science and of other religions; he should have considered the Christian religion wholly distinct from its author. He exclaims:

"But no! here at once an exception is interposed. In every other domain, we are told, even in that of every other religion, we would proceed in this way; but not in Christianity. In this the Author is himself at the same time also the object of the religion. Indeed?

It is now almost a hundred years (it was in 1780), that Lessing wrote the eight sections under the title, 'The Religion of Christ,' which constitute the brief conception of his entire polemics against the orthodoxy of his time. Has Strauss never heard of this? Has he never read: 'Whether Christ was more than man is a *problem*. That he was a real man, if he was one at all; that he never ceased to be man; that is *decided*. Therefore, the religion of Christ and the Christian religion are two quite different things. The former, the religion of Christ, was that religion which he himself recognized and practiced; which every man can have in common with him; which every man must the more earnestly desire to have in common with him, the more elevated and attractive the character is which he conceives for himself of Christ as a mere man.' This was uttered already almost a hundred years ago; and if there is any thing that can be regarded as in the clearest manner characteristic of modern Christianity, it is certainly this, that the 'religion of Christ' is placed instead of the 'Christian religion;' that Jesus is no longer revered as the *object* of religion, but is recognized only as the *guide* in religion."

Dr. Rauwenhoff insists that Strauss ought to have accepted the results and stand-points of "modern Christianity," and concludes by indignantly crying out against the other method he chose to pursue. "Is that fair play?" So far as making Jesus Christ himself the supporting corner-stone of our religion, we think it is "fair play," in spite of the determined protests of the Leyden theologian.

The tenor of this answer to Strauss' book can be judged from the specimens we have given; and many, perhaps the majority, of the answers Germany and Holland have produced, are much after the same style of thinking and reasoning, and not any more satisfactory. In view of such attempts to meet these unbelieving assaults on Christian faith, we feel like exclaiming,—

"Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget."

("Not such aid, not such defenders as these, the time needs.")

Yet, in all these multitudinous, various, and conflicting answers to Strauss, however unsatisfactory they individually may be, the weaknesses of his arguments are exposed, even at the hand of the boldest freethinkers; and it is a great lesson to see the enemy destroyed by the rude hands of his own. Let us further say it in all earnestness, the questions that are here the themes of controversy, are questions that the spirit of this restless age is pressing upon us; to know them well, to meet them well, is a serious necessity and duty.

How wide-spread are the radically false views concerning Christ and "his Gospel," which we have here pointed out and illustrated, and what a strong dominion they have secured in the minds of men, is seen from the bold language used, both by Strauss and his reviewers. Yet we must also add, in conclusion, that there is nothing more characteristic of the unreliable, ill-founded, proud arrogance of all these avowed and unavowed, conscious and unconscious, enemies of "*The Old Faith*," of evangelical Christianity, than such declarations as we find every-where repeated in their books, of

the *universality* of their antichristian views. When we hear Strauss say that "to regard Christ as a divine being, has long since been given up by all thinking men;" or Dr. Rauwenhoff, that "no one in the world any longer recognizes the ancient picture of Christian faith as his own," and many other things as false as these, we know what to think of the proud boast of learning, unbiased freedom of mind, and exemplary candor, which is ever flowing from the lips and pens of these emancipated kings and vassals of "modern thought."

2.—*Deutsches Leben in Nordamerika, Reiseeindrücke. Von H. KRUMMACHER, Evangelischer Pfarrer.* (German Life in North America, Impressions of Travel. By H. KRUMMACHER, Evangelical Minister, Neusalz-on-the-Oder.) 1874. 12mo. pp. 156.

THE writer of this interesting book was one of the German delegates to the great "Protestant Council," the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York, in 1873, and this book is the fruit of his observations during this visit to the United States, extended over some eight weeks. This space of time, while it is not long enough to enable even a man of intelligence, familiar with the English tongue, to gain any thing like a satisfactory knowledge of our country, is yet sufficient for a man of some previous preparation, and of close and intelligent observation, to see and learn a good deal of the general life of the American people. The book reveals that the author came here with a disposition altogether friendly toward us, and not in the spirit of so many travelers from the Old World—that of a haughty prepossession against all that is American, and in favor only of that which is European, and of their own particular country and people. As a rule, German travelers (we mean, of course, the educated and intelligent men like Professor F. Von Raumer and F. Loeher) come here as friends and willing to judge justly of what they see and hear.

Professor V. Raumer, who visited the United States in 1844, and Franz Loeher, whose visit was in 1847, in their books evince an intelligence and a candor of judgment, and a high appreciation of all that is great and good in our country and history. The former, the eminent Professor of History in University of Berlin, who, like Ulysses, had seen many lands, and was very competent to judge of nations and their history, declared in the Preface of his book: "Many at home prophesied to me, that when I should return from the United States I would be cured of all *favorable* prepossessions in its behalf, and would bring back an *unfavorable* judgment of the country and the people. Precisely the reverse of this!" This eminent man, one of the most competent observers of men and things Europe ever sent to our shores, concludes his admirable chapter on the State of Ohio, of whose history and constitution he treats at length, as an example and

model of the American States, with the following anecdote. The lady referred to is the wife of an eminent German physician in Cincinnati:

"With a lady I had the following conversation: 'Has no American lady yet touched your heart?' 'Age does not always prevent folly; I have fallen desperately in love.' 'Might I ask who this favored one is?' 'Her grandfather was born in 1781; her mother was a German.* In all America there are not thirty, yes, hardly three ladies of such beauty, virtue, wisdom, and wealth.' 'But you are married; what will your wife say to this?' 'She is long accustomed to such amours, and will have nothing against it.' 'Have you already acknowledged to the lady your inclination?' 'Certainly, and she has plainly signified to me that she will not withhold her favorable regard from me, as soon as I shall venture to make known to the world my love and admiration.' 'But who, then, is this extraordinary lady?' 'It is the REPUBLIC OF OHIO!'"

Franz Loeher, in the opening of his book, says:

"From my beloved Father-land I went forth to see lands and peoples. I was attracted to see the land of youth, for England, too, showed to me more and deeper miseries than I had seen in the most oppressed regions of Germany or France. America beamed radiantly on the other side of the ocean like freedom and happiness. In this I was not mistaken. I saw a wide land full of immense treasures and of youthful, active men; a land destined forever to occupy a broad and glorious place in the history of the world."

So speak these men; and altogether in the same spirit is the book before us written. We have had, and now have, among us plenty of Germans who have judged very differently, and who have been noisy in their denunciations of every thing here. But these are the decayed drift-wood which the social and political storms of their country and their own vagabond life, have driven to our shores—the "frothing" *Philistines*, to whose utterly perverted and abominable notions and desires of lawless license, the salutary and wise restraints of our institutions of freedom, order, morality, and religion are an odious offense. The blatant voice of these neither deserve nor receive respect on this or the other side of the ocean.

Our author devotes his attention in his book, as the title indicates, especially to "German Life" in this country. It is of interest to see how he sees and judges this, as this element and force in our land is becoming daily stronger, and more important in the determination of our national life. We have space only for some of the most interesting passages.

The great temperance movement can not but concern itself in an especial manner with the German element of our country. This concern the Germans here have fully reciprocated. *Drinking* is a very great question to the Teutonic world, and has been so far back as history goes. Our author could not speak of his people here, at the present hour, without noticing the temperance movements. He gives us what may be regarded as the highest, the most moral "evangelical" German view. He gives it in the language of a Western German Lutheran preacher; it is interesting to hear it:

"The *Sunday Liquor Law* has become, in our community, to such a degree a 'burning' question, that every thinking citizen is obliged to take a position relative to it. Lately the

* The Professor means Pennsylvania.

Evangelical Lutheran Church of this place was asked by the Good Templars' lodge to co-operate in the cause. As we felt constrained to decline this, the undersigned pastor of the Church felt constrained publicly to state the stand-point and the position which the greater part of the Lutheran Church occupies in this matter.

"In the Sunday-law movement two interests play the chief part—a religious and a moral.

"The religiously disposed American dislikes every noisy demonstration on Sunday, both during and after religious service, because he is almost in complete subjection to the puritanical dogma that the Sunday is a continuation and renewal of the Old Testament Sabbath, in which the chief value lay in the external observance of rest and quietness. Were this view well founded, then of course it would be the duty of every good Christian to labor for the recognition and observance of this divine commandment. . . . We reject this view.

"For as the Christian Sunday is not a continuance of the Jewish Sabbath, but the weekly commemoration-day of the resurrection of Christ and of the founding of the Church, we do not admit that we are bound by a divine law to keep Sunday sacred. We hold fast to the words of Paul, "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." We certainly also recognize as a divine law, "Thou shalt remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." We believe, however, that the importance is not in the external quiet, but in the internal observance of the true service of God. Since this spiritual service has, since the most ancient times, been connected by the Christian Church with Sunday, this day must certainly by every Christian be so kept, that the divine worship may be as effectual as possible. External quiet is not necessary for the sake of the day, but for the sake of the worship which the soul renders. Furthermore, we must reject the thought that the Church should attempt, by secular legislation, to force men to the recognition and observance of its laws. We regard this as unbiblical and unevangelical. Much as we regard it our duty as much as possible to bring men to the recognition and acceptance of the true and the good, we know no other religious means for this than the Word, which we use in preaching and in teaching; for, by force of law, at best only hypocrites can be gained, and mostly the evil is only made worse."

The only legal constraint that can *reasonably* be asked, is that no congregation shall be disturbed *during worship*; this is all. He then proceeds:

"In the Sunday law, however, a moral interest also plays a part: the question is, by the greatest possible limitation of the use of intoxicating liquors, to erect a barrier against vice. The usual argument is this: Since the vice of drunkenness creates so much misery, etc., the intoxicating liquors must themselves necessarily be an evil, and their use a sin; therefore, their use must be abandoned and forbidden. But if the laborer, who during the week has little leisure time, can not obtain liquors on Sunday, then he will, perhaps, be saved from the vice of intemperance. Therefore, the temperance law is asked. In this we see as a radical error, that that can be made a sin which can not be one. Not the use, but the abuse of strong drink is sin; that every Christian can readily find in the Bible, where all intemperance is forbidden in the strongest terms but where moderate use is not only allowed, but it is also rejected as false doctrine, that it should be made a sin to men's consciences. Since, therefore, the Sunday law proceeds from a false moral premise, we can, from principle alone, not consent to it. But ought not the Church to do something against drunkenness? Certainly; the Church has in this respect already done its duty before these temperance reformers existed."

The minister then refers to Luther's denunciation of German drunkenness, a denunciation which seems, however, to have borne but little fruit,—for the *saufteufel*, the "devil of drunkenness," is certainly one of the

biggest and most dominant devils in Germany to-day. How little Luther's words have been heeded or his hopes realized, may be seen when we refer to his words in his "Table Talk" about beer. We give these words here, as fitting just now, when so much is said about the innocence of beer, as well as to show how little Germany has heeded the mighty Saxon's words: "The man who first brewed beer," thundered Luther, "*ille fuit pestis Germania*—(he was the plague of Germany). . . . I have prayed to God that he might make an end of this entire brewing business. I have often wished the first brewer had never existed. There is enough barley ruined by beer-brewing to keep all Germany in bread." And so Luther goes on; yet all Germany to-day is swimming in beer. But our evangelical Lutheran pastor says, by way of conclusion—and in this conclusion the ugly animus of his plea is revealed:

"Finally, we can not unite in the movement, since we can not believe that the Good Templars' lodge is called to be the nurse of virtue and of Christianity. We fear that by this lodge one devil is to be expelled by another, and that the last evil will become greater than the first, or, why are drawn into these lodges girls and women, who certainly need not by any vows to protect themselves against drunkenness? Does not the whole movement tend to suppress a coarse vice in order (consciously or unconsciously) to cultivate more refined, but more dangerous ones, so that not a reformation, but a refinement of vice is the last aim? . . . With such business, however, we wish under no circumstances to have any thing to do."

This is the best evangelical argument, and as such it must be weighed and appreciated. Our author himself has no very high opinion of the crusades. It is a social and moral phenomenon, however, that excites his attention in an especial manner, for he makes mention of it immediately in the very beginning of his Preface, and concludes his remarks on it by saying: "That it should have come to this *crusade*, and that such judgments have been expressed of it shows, at any rate, how deeply the evil against which it is directed has struck its roots, and how heavily it weighs on the society, and especially on the domestic life of North America." This is a true observation, and indicates the real cause of this remarkable social movement.

The writer devotes a chapter to the *anti-religious propagandisms* in the United States, and especially to the efforts of German infidelity here. He recognizes that in the German element of our population there is a strong and bitter opposition to Christianity, and that this opposition is actively carried on by means of the press and society organizations.

"Last year (1873) there were circulated in German circles, among other documents, a treatise entitled, 'Six Letters to a Pious Man,' and Buechner's book, 'Force and Matter' (Kraft und Stoff). As indicative of the character of the first pamphlet, which was sold at ten dollars per hundred, we may cite the leading proposition,—'*I reject, in the most determined manner, the idea and name of a God.*' Buechner's book—of which an American account with truth says, That it asserts, in the boldest form the eternity of matter, and denies the existence of God and the personal, continued existence of man,—was, in a cheap edition,

sent *gratis* by a New York German book importer to all the subscribers of a foreign magazine.* The German political newspapers are almost all edited in a spirit hostile to Christianity. The German *Turner-associations* appear throughout to make gymnastic exercises a secondary matter, and an organized war upon Christianity and Church the chief aim."

The impression of the writer is, that these German propagandists do not meet with much success. One thing which he notes, we know to be true, and that is, that the German infidel lecturers brought here from Europe have always utterly failed to draw audiences and to "pay," even among their friends; so of their vile literature. This, however, is not owing to a lack of large masses of German infidels, but rather to the fact that the great majority of these blatant, vulgar blasphemers have neither mind enough to concern themselves about the propagandism, nor sacrificing interest enough to give their money. This fact, just stated, is a very marked and, by their own apostles, oft noted and denounced, characteristic of these miserable *Philistines*. Those familiar with the current history of German infidels here, know that their leaders are eternally abusing their fraternity for their abominable meanness in refusing to give "the vile trash-money" (*das Bettelgeld*; Karl Heinzen's term,)—for the cause. Outsiders have scarcely any idea of the "meanness" in this respect of the German brotherhood of unbelief, and of the incessant din of abuse they get for it from their *coryphæi*. It was always a treat to hear Heinzen in this strain from St. Louis to New York. If you want "fuming" and "frothing" (*geifern*, as our author calls it,) among the beer-glasses or in the *Turner-halls*, you can get a superabundance of this; but no money! No! no! *that* is better appropriated in the beer-saloons and beer-gardens. *This* is the true secret of the failure of lecture and book propagandism. Nothing is more characteristic of these miserable people than their extreme lack of intellectual hunger and thirst.

Our author protests against fastening the charge of "German infidelity" on the German people generally; but adds, that one chief cause of this American prejudice against the Germans is to be found in "the impious and conscienceless newspaper writers who, by their constant preaching of the extremest and most vulgar infidelity, and their base reviling of all that is holy, have systematically depraved the German people, and got them into bad repute among American Christians." He sees that the good German name has been dishonored "and made a byword as '*German infidels*' by the many bad children of Germany that have here apostatized from the faith of their fathers; and by their godlessness, Sabbath desecration, beer-drinking, and other such things, have created the impression that the entire German people were of this sort."

* The *Gartenlaube*, we suppose, a belletristic German journal, one of the "organs" of the Buechner men, and filled with the slimy, insidious poison of German, materialistic atheism. Buechner's letters from the United States were published in this magazine. American Christians sometimes subscribe for it, ignorant of its true character.

Our author speaks freely of the "sect-life" in our country; but unhesitatingly declares (and he is certainly able to judge) that, after all, there is no more controversy (perhaps even less) among the "sects" here than in the bosom of the home Church in his own country; and this we know to be true.

There is especial need just now for such men as the writer of this book to come here from the German Empire, and to carry such tidings back, as this will teach lessons that may lead to a far better way of managing religious matters in Germany than that now so unfortunately adopted by the Imperial Government at the instance and under the dominion of Bismarck. Let *greater freedom*, not *greater bondage*, be the watchword!

- 3.—*Das neue Wissen und der neue Glaube. Mit besonderer Beruecksichtigung von D. F. Strauss' neuester Schrift: "Der alte und der neue Glaube."* Von I. FROHSCHAMMER, Professor in Muenchen. (The New Science—Knowledge—and the New Faith. With special reference to D. F. Strauss' latest book, "The Old and the New Faith." By I. FROHSCHAMMER, Professor in Munich.) Leipsic: F. A. Brockhaus. 1873. 8vo. pp. xvi, 201.

As Dr. Nippold, in his notice of Strauss' reviewers, observes, "It is an especially remarkable fact, that from the most important religious manifestation of our day—Old Catholicism—have come forth so many and such strong opponents of Strauss." The most prominent of these are Huber (author of "The Pope and the Council."), Professor Knoodt, and Frohschammer. The most "orthodox" of these is Professor Knoodt; Huber occupies a freer middle ground; and Frohschammer represents the "left," the rationalistic tendency. We can not see much essential difference between Frohschammer's conception of Christianity and the New Testament and that of Rauwenhoff and Nippold. They must have very "liberal" views among the Catholic professors at Munich, if Professor Frohschammer is a fair representative. We presume, however, that it would be hardly just so to regard him; at least, nothing we have seen from Doellinger, Friedrich, and others, would lead us to place these in the same category with Frohschammer. One thing, however, may be said: the Catholic scholars—including not a few members of the priesthood, and theologians—who have been educated at the mixed universities, where Catholics and Protestants mingle, and where, while there are two *theological* Faculties, all the students attend the lectures of the same professors in the other faculties—have often drunk in the same "liberal" ideas with the Protestant students—in philosophy (the determining power in every thing else), natural science, history, etc. The freer Catholics are therefore to be found in these universities, and have gone forth from them; besides, not a few Catholic students attend, for a part of their academic course, at least, purely Protestant universities. Beneath the surface, behind the external yielding to dogma and practice, these "liberal" ideas in philosophy and religion are widely spread

among the Catholics, laymen and clergy, on the Continent, especially in Germany. Many of these, following their convictions, have now arranged themselves among the Old Catholics; many others suppress their true conviction from the still stronger influence of old affection to Church, and of less worthy motives.

The author's own stand-point is clearly set forth in the opening of his book,—a stand-point occupied with various shades of differences by the great mass of the "modern" religionists, critics, and theologians. The following passage is sufficient to give us an idea of our author's conception of religion and Christianity, and from it we may at once see how he would judge Strauss' book:

"The expansion of the sphere of knowledge brings with it a contraction of the domain of faith; progress in understanding, therefore, necessarily is to the prejudice of faith, weakens it, or actually destroys it, at least in its traditional so-called 'positive' form and authority. This is precisely the present state of things, especially with the enlightened nations of Europe. A great religious crisis has partly already come upon us, and partly is yet in process of development. A similar fact has, however, already repeatedly happened in the life of cultivated peoples. This was especially the case when the religion of classic antiquity passed away and the religious want and desire, seeking for a new form, found satisfaction and peace in Christianity."

The history of this crisis is well known to us, and presents with the present so many points of similarity, that it seems fitting to consider it for a moment:

"At the time when Christianity entered into history and began to exert its influence, the so-called pagan religion of the nations of classical antiquity was already hopelessly doomed to perish. Among the cultivated Greeks and Romans the faith in the old gods was shaken, or had entirely passed away, and at the most, the uncultivated class alone still clung to it. The religion of the classic nations that had created so much that was splendid in art and science, gradually became only the peasant-religion—*Paganism*. But it was precisely this art and science which was preparing its fate. There was scarcely a special conflict necessary for this, as in the modern time; the rise and development alone of a scientific contemplation of nature and history was sufficient for this. For this religion was, in its essential nature, bound to nature and its deification, to the personification of natural objects, and the mythical conception of natural phenomena. It was only necessary to consider these as what they really were, as things and phenomena of nature, and their supernatural character and divinity vanished. Olympus lost its divinities as soon as the mountain was known in its natural constitution; the sun was no longer the divine Phœbus-Apollo, if the philosopher Anaxagoras was right in declaring that it was a glowing mass. Nature, therefore, was stripped of its divinity in the [measure in which it was understood naturally and rationally, and so divested of its supernaturalness; and in the same measure, also, the popular faith was destroyed. Ought it to have been forbidden, in order not to touch and to destroy the people's possession of their faith, to inquire into nature itself and into the nature and history of man? Had it not been better, rather, to suppress or prevent Grecian philosophy and the entire culture of antiquity, than that the people should have had their faith and consolation weakened or taken from them? If the principles of our orthodox defenders of the faith were true, and were universally valid, as incontestable, reliable principles ought to be, then these questions should unhesitatingly be answered affirmatively. The authorities of antiquity ought also to have raged with fire and sword against science and unbelief in favor of the popular religion. Nor, indeed, did the matter pass away without the persecution of the representatives of science of that day. Anaxagoras, because of his above-cited views of the true nature of the sun, had to go into exile; Socrates was condemned to

the poisoned chalice, because he denied the gods of the State—but, in reality, because he every-where sought after reason and truth; and, therefore, in an eminent sense, was what the 'positive' believers reproach and condemn as 'rationalist.' Aristotle, toward the end of his life, considered it prudent to escape from Athens, that the Athenians might not again sin against philosophy. But of the horrors which were committed for centuries in the Christian or rather ecclesiastical age, in favor of the true faith, and yet more of hierarchal authority and rule, classic antiquity, so far as we know, was free, at least until the corrupt age of the Roman emperors with their persecutions of the Christians. Precisely the practice of these, at a later day, the Roman Popes followed in the persecutions of heretics.

"But now, for this religion that had passed away, this now lifeless, perished faith in the gods and their activity in the world, with all its consolation and terror, a compensation had to be found for man."

This compensation, according to our author, was found in Christianity. But Christianity, he proceeds now to show, was essentially a human development—not a divine revelation and institution, as we, according to the New Testament, understand it to be. It was the result and product of the human mind, seeking and striving earnestly after what it needed, and was formed from the philosophical and higher religious elements present and developing at the date of the Christian era, in which the Philonic (Philo, the Alexandrian Jew) religious, philosophical element represents and plays a prominent part. Into this combination came the great personality of Jesus, the great Jewish teacher and his doctrine, as the transforming and controlling power and part,—“the living principle that was yet wanting to give life and activity” to the “system already prepared by the philosophical speculation” of that age. Our author, of course, recognizes Jesus as a God-sent prophet and Messiah; but this only in the rationalistic sense which makes free and easy use of such words. The system of Christianity as it stands complete in the New Testament, and as it appears in the primitive Church, is largely a human fabrication and corruption of the religion of Jesus. In fine, religion can, and ought to be, under human control for revision, change, and this revision and change ought now to take place, and is now taking place; the ancient faith, not simply the corrupted, but the New Testament faith, is to give way before “The New Knowledge” of our age, and a “New Faith” is to take the place of “the Old,” just as the old Pagan religion gave way and faded out of sight, at the time of the Christian era, before the “New Knowledge” of that day. Here our author judges and condemns Strauss, precisely as does Rauwenhoff, because he insists on conceiving Christianity only as it stands in the Old Faith and in the New Testament. Strictly interpreted, Frohschammer's reasoning is, throughout, about the same as that of the Leyden theologian.

The author has no idea that the Christian religion is the only true, divine one. He says:

“Every religion is fundamentally of the same nature, and has for its aim the solution of the same problem,—the restoration and bringing into active operation of a relation between two factors, the one an objective divine, the other subjective human. Religion is, therefore, of a generic nature, of which the various religions that represent it in actual life

are species. In each one of these religions the object of the religious faith and cultus is attainable, of course more or less perfectly, the natural religious want of man is met, and in each is revealed, be it even in a very imperfect manner, the eternal nature of religion, founded at the same in the divine and in the ideal nature of the human soul. That some religions are absolutely divine and others absolutely undivine or even devilish, must be regarded and rejected as a delusion and an arrogance."

Such is religious stand-point, and such the method and ground of argument of this Old-Catholic professor of Munich against Strauss. That Strauss himself, were he yet living, at least as far as the answers to his first question are concerned, would feel himself safe against such assaults, is clear.

In the answer to the second question of Strauss' book, in which questions of science, politics, etc., come up for discussion, these assailants deal the book severer blows. But space forbids quotations from those parts of our author. We conclude with what he says of Strauss himself. It is noteworthy that Strauss, the mere religious rationalist of 1835, in his "Life of Jesus" then written, pleased these "modern theologians and critics" very much. But when, in this, his last book, which he honestly and very significantly calls "a confession," he reveals the logical end of all this "modern thought" as regards religion, they at once, and with singular unanimity, rise up indignantly against him; he has betrayed them—that is, exposed the entire inconsistency of their ground in this bold, honest, final "confession,"—*hinc ira illa*..

"D. F. Strauss," he says in the Preface, "was, therefore, in the fullest sense, right, when he, nearly forty years ago, brought together the results gained in the Biblical, critical, and historical investigations into a great whole, published his 'Life of Jesus,' and opposed the hitherto only traditional, uncritical faith. It was an act that revealed more intellectual power and moral courage than the majority of his opponents united could bring together. The moral and scientific merit of this act will remain imperishable, and is well worth the certain yet mild martyrdom which it brought upon its author during his whole life. The more, therefore, do we regret that Strauss has now fallen into the opposite extreme, and abandoning the purely human, rational, ideal stand-point, which he had gained in his conflict with the supernatural, irrational stand-point of faith, has apostatized into the sub-human, materialistic, that is not less unjustifiable and injurious than the former. . . . Our regret is so much the greater and more just, as we are now threatened with a new, bigoted priestcraft of atheism and materialism, which will be not less fanatical against those differing from it than the 'supernatural' one, and which demands the same blind faith for all its assertions, however unfounded, and therefore proceeds in the same uncritical manner. Whoever looks at the writings of the most renowned representatives of materialism, will easily see this."

A distinctive characteristic of Professor Frohschammer's book is, that it aims and carries all its conclusions against Jesuitic Roman Catholicism. This spirit of war against Popery and Jesuitism pervades every page. The immediate cause for this is, as can easily be judged, that the author lives and writes in the bosom of a Catholic community and country, and one of the centers of the Old-Catholic movement against Jesuitic Catholicism. The book has force and its own special value, and deserves to be read and pondered, as an indication of the present state of religious sentiment in Old Europe, and, indeed, of our age.